DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 818 CS 503 900

AUTHOR Novak, Clare, Ed.; Conboy, Marilyn, Ed.
TITLE Ezra Christian Buehler: His Life and Professional Ideas.
INSTITUTION Kansas Speech Communication Association.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 258p.
AVAILABLE FROM Kansas Speech Communication Society, 356 Murphy Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045 ($10.00 prepaid).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Biographies; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Principles; Higher Education; *Speech Communication; *Speech Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Buehler (Ezra Christian)

ABSTRACT

Undertaken at the request of students and colleagues, and because of the many request for copies of his speeches, this book presents a biography and speech transcripts of Ezra Christian Buehler, long-time professor of speech communication at the University of Kansas. Following the preface, the first section contains a biographical sketch, punctuated with Buehler's own recollections. The second section comprises the major portion of the book, and is divided into four chapters concerning Buehler's professional ideas. The first chapter contains reflections on the history of the speech profession, while the second chapter contains speeches made during Buehler's tenure at the University of Kansas. Chapter three contains essays and speech transcripts dealing with the nature of the speech act and human communication. The fourth chapter contains recollections of Buehler's experiences with orator William Jennings Bryan, and concludes with Buehler's 10 guidelines for happiness while growing older. (HTH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED219819

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# EZRA CHRISTIAN BUEHLER

## His Life and Professional Ideas

Edited by
Clare Novak and Marilyn Conboy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bobby R. Patton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by:
Kansas Speech Communication Society
356 Murphy Hall
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

CS503900

1982

Education is more than learning about things and what to do with them. It helps you to pick the kernel from the chaff, the wise from the foolish, the enjoyable from the dull and boring. It is a lifelong mission, but never a mission impossible. Education is the kind of stuff that feeds on itself--the more you get, the more able you are to get more. It forms the fabric of life by which the "cup runneth over."

E.C.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE .....v

SECTION I

THE LIFE OF E. C. BUEHLER:
THE EARLY YEARS.....1

Happiness Is .....23

SECTION II

THE PROFESSIONAL IDEAS OF E. C. BUEHLER ..25

CHAPTER ONE: Reflections On The History
Of The Speech Profession....27

Talking To Myself.....29
Some Reflections .....35
Reflections In A Personal And
Professional Sense.....49
History And Trends In
Speech Education.....55
Reflections About A
Profession Extraordinary.....73
A Profession Extraordinary--
Made In U.S.A.....81
Looking To The Future Through
The Past.....91

CHAPTER TWO: Reflections On The University Of Kansas.....99

Address For The 50th Anniversary Of Delta Sigma Rho.....101
Meet The Miracle Man .....105
Professor Buehler's Banquet Speech.....109
History Of Forensics At The University Of Kansas.....113
Some Thanksgiving Thoughts .....125

CHAPTER THREE: Examining the Speech Act 129

Booklet Prepared For The Annual Steelworkers Institute.....131
Problems Unique To Speech Education From Both Sides Of The Learning Process .....151
The Emerging Concepts Concerning Communication As Related To The Speech Art.....165
Ten Guidelines For The Speech Maker.....176
Hard-Core Dimensions Of Speech Making .....178
An Overview Of Behavioral Manifestations Of Speech Communication During A Lifespan .....179
Speech Communication And Modern Man Or Course #145 And "You".....183
I Come Not To Bury My Friend But To Praise Him .....199
Structuring The Communication Act...203
When One Man Faces Another: Four Dimensions Of Communication ...217
Are You Listening? .....229

CHAPTER FOUR: Remembering the Chautauqua .....235

William Jennings Bryan-- An Eye-Witness Report .....237
Culture Under Canvas .....243
The Chautauqua .....261
Ten Guidelines For Happiness While Growing Older .....264

## PREFACE

This project was undertaken because of the requests of students and colleagues and requests for copies of speeches presented by E. C. Buehler.

Buehler once wrote in a set of guidelines for the speech maker: "Remember, a speech is not just an essay on its hind legs. It is a one-time, face-to-face interview. Use tongue-born rather than pen-born language." Prof practiced what he taught. The transcriptions of speeches included in this volume were often taken from audio recordings of the actual speeches. We have made no attempt to transform Prof's "tongue-born language" into polished essays.

Prof also once said, "Speech forms the image of the man. People come to know and measure us by what we say and how we talk. It

is a mirror of what we are." In this context, those of us who know and respect Prof are glad to have this mirror of the man.

Many people contributed to the development of the manuscript. Marilyn Conboy coordinated the initial collection of the speeches and supervised the typing and production of the book. Prof Buehler generously provided his time in furnishing materials and offering suggestions. Sarah Shaw Hood wrote the biographical section based on her M.A. thesis. William A. Conboy and Wil A. Linkugel provided guidance and counsel throughout the production phases. Glenn Price, Virginia Meserve, and Alan Lerstrom aided in the proofreading. Barbara Blinn assisted in typing the manuscript, and Clare Novak served as the Editor-in-Chief.

The project is dedicated to Ezra Christian and Lois Buehler for the many contributions they have made to enrich the lives of so many.

Bobby R. Patton

SECTION I

# THE LIFE OF E. C. BUEHLER: THE EARLY YEARS

This opening essay is a biography of Buehler's early life and discusses his experiences and schooling through the completion of his Master's degree. This information is adapted from the first chapter of Sarah Shaw Hood's Master's thesis, entitled "The Life and Professional Ideas of Ezra Christian Buehler."

Confirmation, Age 13

"Longevity runs in my family. Grandfather was born just four years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The way I figure it he would have been too old to fight in the war of 1812. My father, Chris Buehler, was born when my grandfather was seventy years old!"

Chris Buehler was born June 19, 1850, in Hornberg, Germany. At the age of seventeen he left his home in the Black Forest and came by steamship to "the land of opportunity." He first arrived in New York City. From there he traveled by railroad to Illinois where he took a job as a farmhand near the town of Sterling. Six years later, in 1873, Chris Buehler married a German-born girl named Mary Kirgis. Together they traveled by wagon and two horses to Sterling, Nebraska, where the prairie land became their home. Chris and Mary weren't citizens of this country, therefore they did not homestead. Chris sold his wagon and horses for a fourth section of land, and it was there that they built their home.

Chris and Mary had three children, Ida, (1877-1880); Dorothy, (1879-1899); and Noah, (1880-1882). Then, as so often happened during those "harder years," Mary and Ida both died of diptheria. They died within forty-eight hours of the birth of Noah.

After the death of Mary and Ida, a girl named Mary Joekel came to work for the Buehlers. She was a Missouri girl (born in Warren County, September 23, 1860). After Mary Buehler's death, Mary Joekel began to care for Chris Buehler and his two children. The relationship among all of them grew and, in 1881, Chris and Mary Joekel were married. They had seven children of their own, six boys and one girl. Two of their sons died during infancy. The other children were (from oldest to youngest): William Arthur, born September 25, 1882, who later operated a farm specializing in thoroughbred hogs. He also held the position of Sunday School Superintendent for twenty-five years in Sterling. Carl Erin, born September 26, 1887,

became a farmer specializing in raising sugar beets and cattle on a farm near Sterling, then later raised potatoes and beets in Gering, Nebraska. Ernest Matthew was born November 3, 1889. He was later a Methodist minister in Iowa for 40 years. Esra Christian Buehler was born May 13, 1894, and Cora Edna, born December 18, 1898, was the only daughter and sister and was particularly close to her brother, Esra.

Esra Christian Buehler was the youngest of the Buehler sons. "Esra," is the German bible spelling for the name of an Old Testament prophet. As a youth, as so many other children have done, he lamented his name. However, later he wrote, "What's in a name? For some it is nothing. For some it is everything. For everybody it is something." Later in life Professor Buehler penned the following essay concerning the meaning his name carried for him throughout his lifetime. In part because of his unusual name, he was followed by a variety of nicknames. Here he discusses how he was affected by each name given him and how names tend to have an impact upon us all.

"Esra' Is My Name

> What's in a name? For some it is nothing. For some it is everything. For everybody it is something. It is an invisible identification of one particular person.
>
> Shakespeare says, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." That's the bunk. It is a beautiful poetic expression with many shades of meaning. Shortly after I came by birth to the corn fields of Nebraska, I was baptized in German, "Esra Christian." I was the last of six boys to be born, and I suspect my parents made a special effort to give me a name with the image of something noble and sentimental. So they chose "Esra," the name of a famous bible priest, and "Christian," a version of my Father's name, "Chris."

Somehow as a youngster , I was not pleased to be called "Esra" in German. When I started to go to the country school, my teacher printed my name "Esra" on the blackboard at the top of the list of pupils for all to see. This was the German Bible spelling, but I didn't know it. After a few days my older brother Ernest talked to the teacher and suggested that since this was a school where we all speak English, she should change my name to "Ezra." She was glad to do that. When I noticed the change in my name, it made me feel great. I was now an American school boy.

As I began to grow up, I was still displeased with my name. I heard many jokes about "Ezra," as a kind of hillbilly, a good-for-nothing fella.

When I was ten or eleven years old, Mother used me as an errand boy to carry cold drinking water in a gallon syrup bucket to my older brothers working in the fields. One morning, while I was on my mission at the end of the corn rows where my brothers were waiting, my brother Carl jokingly remarked, "Look, here he comes, hopping along like a jackrabbit." My brothers, greeting me in good fun, called me "Jack." This started as a joke, but it took hold like wildfire. At once I was affectionately called, "Jack" by my sister and three older brothers. This spread to all my cousins, playmates, even some uncles and aunts, but not to my parents or teachers or preachers. But I sure liked "Jack." It almost made a new person out of me. But when I started high school, the name "Jack" fell into a deathtrap. My schoolmates and teachers would have none of it.

When I became a sophomore in college at age 22, I got rebaptized without water or ceremony. I was working as crew foreman for the Red Path Horner traveling chautauqua. On my first day of work, one of the workmen called out to me, "Say, mister, what is your name? We don't know what to call you." I replied, "My name is Ezra." The workmen frowned and almost dropped their tools. "Call me any name you like," I said. One shouted out, "How about Bill?" I said, "That's fine." That did it. Before the day was over, every workman, superintendent, lady supervisor, even chautauqua talent called me "Bill." This name took hold in a big way for people close to me the rest of my life. Even the faculty during my graduate studies called me "Bill." I became known by that name at speech conventions and faculty circles in all the universities where I taught. But I remained "Ezra" for my parents and three older brothers. One called me "Bill" for the first time after 57 years.

My students called me "Prof," "Professor," or "Doctor." For the first half of my professional life, I signed my articles, books, and business letters, "E. C. Buehler." In later years, I used, "E. Christian Buehler." However, for all my accounts with banks, brokerage firms, and business dealings, I used the name "Ezra C. Buehler."

There seems to be some kind of a mysterious hidden power for good or evil in a name. We are familiar with many names which are not the real ones, such as Babe Ruth, Mark Twain, Muhammad Ali, Lady Bird, Josh Billings, Bob Hope, Phog Allen, Bing Crosby, Dinah Shore, Adolf Hitler, and many more.

Our new pastor, Homer Henderson of our church, in his first sermon, asked to be called "Butch." He made the point that we could call our dog "Homer," but "Butch" was his name. At first I thought this was a sacrilege. But "Butch" took hold in a sublime, noble way and soon carried the image of someone who was much more than just the pastor of our church.

What would have happened to Germany and the world in general if Hitler would have used his real name, "Schickelgruber"? A good chance World War II would never have occurred. Imagine the vocal floundering and stumbling by crowds shouting and cheering this 14-letter word, "Heil Schickelgruber!"

The Bible is filled with incidents about the importance of a name in person-to-person communication. The burning bush pattern the Lord used with Moses was not the ultimate. We get this message in Exodus 11-17: "And the Lord said unto Moses: I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken. For thou has found grace in my sight and I know thee by name."

Your name is both a mirror and catalyzer to communicate sides and angles of your total self as well as attitudes which govern your behavior. A name is not something fixed and hard like a rock. It is something flexible, something that can change and grow or shrink as a communication medium covering a whole life span. In a more noble and ideal sense, your name is the mantle of your personality--the authentic identification of your personhood--and the heartbeat of your inner self and personal sovereignty. It is yours and yours alone--the one two-legged,

walking masterpiece of the creative process.

The Buehler family worked a half-section of farmland in Sterling, Nebraska. Their main crop was corn. They also raised a few hundred pigs and chickens, had a dozen milking cows and a dozen horses. The Buehlers produced ninety percent of all the food they ate; fruits, vegetables, meats and poultry were among the list. There was no electricity, and food was cooked on a woodburning stove. The oldest brother, Will, cut the boys' hair. "My mother made all the bread and all of our clothes, except overalls. She knitted our socks and mittens, bed covers and quilts...she was a great knitter...she could knit in the dark."[1]

Perhaps Buehler's interest in communication began far earlier than anyone realizes. As a young lad he was thrilled by an opportunity to talk to his teacher on the telephone--then a novel experience on the farm at Sterling, Nebraska. The following, "First In The Family To Use The Telephone," is an account of this thrilling experience.

First In The Family To Use The Telephone

The telephone and rural free delivery came our way on the farm about the same time. It was strongly rumored that the telephone was about to appear for us country folks. The event was anticipated with much excitement about a year before this actually happened. One spring morning Father took me along at age six for some shopping ventures in town.

Tourtellot's big store was the main shopping center in Sterling. It had all kinds of grocery supplies, items of clothing, candy and dime store items. Father was shopping for a shirt or a pair of overalls. His clerk, speaking a broken English, leaned over the counter and said to

me, "Esra, how would you like to talk over the telephone?" I was deeply thrilled to get this kind of attention. I saw father smile and knew he was pleased. John remarked, "Would you like to talk to Mary Carter, your teacher?" That put the frosting on the cake.

John took my hand and lead me down the aisle halfway across the store. The telephone was on the wall nearly six feet from the floor. By today's standards it looked like a museum piece. There was the obvious wooden box, nearly a foot square. On the left side was a small crank to turn clockwise to get central. On the front top were two bells about the size of a silver dollar, electrically operated by a central switchboard. About a foot below the bells was a long transmitter or mouthpiece which could be moved up or down to accomodate the person talking.

Another store clerk watching what was going on brought a sturdy chair for me to stand on. John lifted me up on this chair and pulled down the transmitter as far as he could and gave me brief instructions on what to do and how. So John turned the crank to get central. I held the receiver to my left ear and heard a man's voice say, "Number, please." John knew the central and simply said, "Please ring Mary Carter." I could hear a few short rings then a lady's voice said, "Hello, this is Mary Carter speaking." John spoke into the transmitter, saying who he was and reported that a boy, Esra Buehler, would like to talk to his teacher. That did it. It was a glorious moment for me. I was so excited, I didn't know what to say, but Miss Carter was so friendly that she made me feel relaxed. I have no idea what we talked about. It really

doesn't matter. Our visit was short, and I went home on cloud nine.

Religion was important to the Buehler family, and young Buehler grew up in a strict, German Methodist neighborhood. In this community of 44 families, over a 20-year span, there were no divorces. There was also no smoking, no beer drinking, no movies, no sale of anything on Sunday. Girls wore no lipstick or jewelry, and there was no dancing. What did they do? "Well, we prayed a lot, 'familia andacht', morning and evening prayer. My father conducted prayer sessions by reading from the Bible. This lasted three to five minutes several times daily. Mother did it when father was gone. Father was the Sunday School Superintendent for 25 years in Sterling. My brother Will followed this role for another 25 years after my father's term."[2]

As a youth Ezra Buehler was a serious-minded boy. He never lost his temper. "I believed it was a sin to show anger," he says, "and I was extremely honest...too honest for our society." As a young man, the ten commandments from the Bible were strictly taught--and adhered to. "Which one did I feel most strongly about? HONOR THY MOTHER AND THY FATHER...and I did!"[3]

But there were fun times too, and community activities at Sterling revolved around such things as Sunday School picnics, which were held in a large grove or pasture. There would be a morning program consisting of speeches and singing, and, in the afternoon, they would play baseball...the married men versus the unmarried.[4] Some of those games held special importance for young Ezra Buehler. At the age of sixteen he made the County Cousin baseball team as its right fielder. This success was of great importance to the developing teenager. Later in life Buehler wrote about this activity and recalled an important game played late in the summer of 1910.

## One Home Run In A Lifetime

I like baseball. It has always been my favorite sport as a player and spectator. For the people in the German Methodist farm community, baseball was more than a material sport. It furnished much-needed entertainment at a time when there were no automobiles, radios or moving pictures. More important still, it offered us farm boys an opportunity to become actively involved in the sport. Spectators meant little; playing the game meant everything .

We always found a way midst cultivating the fields and haymaking to play "catch" or chase fly balls during the noon hour or after doing the evening chores. Sunday afternoon was a favorite time for a group of boys to get together in some pasture to choose up sides to play "One Old Cat" or a modified version of baseball.

Next to Christmas the most outstanding event of the year was the annual June Sunday School Picnic held in a large grove surrounded by green pastures. The festive day started off with a program of speeches and music, followed by foot races and jumping contests. There were many firecrackers, plenty of homemade ice cream, lemonade, soda pop and candy. Each family came prepared to have its own family picnic dinner. Following the noon dinner feast came the big event of the day, the great baseball game between the single and married men. This mini "All-Star Game" would be talked about for weeks in the harvest fields and even before the hot stoves during wintertime.

Somehow in this baseball-minded community, there emerged a baseball team composed of first cousins from

three families whose mothers were sisters. The formation of this team of country cousins was largely accomplished by one middle-aged man by the name of Christian Biesemeyer. We called him "Uncle Chris." How he loved baseball and somehow managed to handle us boys. He was the coach, manager, instructor and general supervisor. He helped the team acquire their uniforms and equipment from Sears Roebuck and taught them the strategy and rudiments of the game. It was my desperate wish to make this team, and eventually I did as a right fielder, youngest on the team--age 16.

Since we had no facilities to accomodate visiting teams, Uncle Chris managed to schedule all games with teams from nearby towns. The year 1910 stands out as our most illustrious season. By mid-August we had played most of the nearby towns. We played only on holidays and Saturdays, never on Sunday. Sunday baseball, open to the public with admission charge, was strictly prohibited for religious reasons.

The big final game of the year came late in August with Lewiston at carnival time. There was a purse of $15.00 winner-take-all, instead of the usual 60-40 split. On this big day, we traveled some fifteen miles to Lewiston in separate buggies, carrying our lunch baskets with us. We arrived at the ball park an hour and a half before game time. After a spirited practice on the diamond for our allotted time, we gathered around the water barrel for a big drink of well water. I could feel the team's tension. Our coach could feel it too. He simply said in a quiet voice: "Boys, relax; take it easy. Play ball and have fun."

The crowd was much larger than expected with several hundred fans overflowing the grandstand, sitting and standing on the grass behind first and third base. The cheering was tremendous from the first pitch. The Country Cousins were the favorites, and the teams seemed evenly matched. At the end of six innings, the score was 2-2. Then Lewiston scored twice in the bottom of the seventh. At the top of the eighth inning, we were behind 4-2. My brother Carl, batting clean-up spot, led off with a double. Charles Werner popped up; Arthur Starkebaum struck out; then Walter Werner got a scratch infield hit, moving Carl to third.

Now it was my turn, number nine in batting order, with two outs and two men on base. Oh, if I could only hit a homerun. Someone had broken my favorite bat in the last inning; we had only three bats left for the whole team. I chose the heavy 40 ounce stick. I had practiced with this bat at home, and I liked it for the long ball. The first pitch was right over the plate. I swung hard but missed. The next two pitches were balls. Then I fouled one down the third base line. I heard Uncle Chris call out, "Take it easy, Ezra; it takes only one to hit it!" I took a deep breath. The next pitch was a fast ball right over the plate, hip-high. I reached back and took a healthy swing, connecting squarely for a line drive toward the left field. I knew by the roar of the crowd that it was gone for good. The ground was hard and dry with no backstop fence. I could have walked to home plate. My three-run homer won the game. This was my greatest moment of glory in baseball. I wouldn't trade it for a place in baseball's hall of fame.

> Most important of all, this sparked a feeling of self-importance. A feeling that I was somebody began to bloom. The expression, "Kid, what can you do?" from my Father and three older brothers haunted my yearning for self-renewal. After one swing of the bat, I could say, "Yes, I needed that."

Ezra Buehler had entered high school in Sterling in 1910. This had special meaning for him since he was the youngest and only one of four boys to attend high school.[5] High school was made possible by a long awaited move by the Buehler family from the farm to their new home six miles from the town of Sterling. His parents, however, viewed with reluctance the possibility of high school for Ezra. Getting a high school degree was far beyond the dreams of his parents, who knew nothing but rugged farm life in pioneer days. Chris Buehler didn't think much of high school in the context of education unless one's plans were to become a preacher, lawyer, doctor, or politician.[6]

In Sterling, the Buehlers were some distance from the old community in which Ezra had spent his youth. They were six miles away from their German Methodist church, which had great impact on Chris Buehler, since he had served as Sunday School Superintendent for 25 years. In the new community, there were only English-speaking denominational churches, but no service in the familiar German language. "I managed to go to Sunday School and church frequently," Buehler recalls, "But the English God was something else. He was not the same as the German God I knew when I was growing up.[7] English prayer used 'thee and thou'...this gave me the image of something distant and mysterious.[8] This created a kind of vacuum for my inner self and a worshipful attitude."[9]

Sterling was altogether a different world for the young Buehler. His social life narrowed. Friends and relatives to whom he had

grown close over the past sixteen years were now too far away to visit on any regular basis. His father imposed a family curfew for Ezra and his sister. He set 10:00 p.m. as a deadline for them to be home. His closest friends in the new community were among the other high school students and his teachers. He got involved in extra-curricular activities. These included playing baseball on the high school team, debating, and acting in several high school plays.

When he graduated in 1914, there were eight in his graduating class. Two hours after receiving his diploma, May 22, 1914, he boarded the midnight flyer headed west for the wheat fields and cattle ranches of eastern Washington. This was not a sudden sneak flight from the nest. This was a break-away that was in the making for many months. His parents knew that he was headed for the state of Washington to become a country school teacher. "As I was about to step out of the house with suitcase in hand to walk five blocks to the railroad station, Father reached into his pocket and handed me $47.60 to help pay for my railroad ticket."[10]

Ezra Buehler's journey began on that day in late May 1914. He was headed for a new world nearly 2,000 miles away, bound for Harrington, Washington. His trip on the Night Flyer would last three nights and two and one-half days.

When he arrived at Harrington he was met by a team of horses hitched to a spring-wagon which came from his new home thirteen miles away. He later recalls, "I had $2.75 left in my pocket from the money my Father had given me when I arrived in Harrington."[11]

Buehler began working on a one-section land farm doing various activities. These included tending to the farm animals and working in the harvest fields during the wheat harvest. For tending to the farm animals, he was paid $1.00 per day, plus his room and board. He worked for extra pay during the wheat harvest as a

sack-juggler (one who packed the wheat in gunny sacks). The wheat harvest on this farmland was the big event of the year. It involved five men and thirty horses used to operate a moving combine harvester which cut and thrashed wheat at the same time. The wheat was collected and sewed in the large gunny sacks and tied on the spot. As a sack-juggler, Ezra was paid $2.50. He worked the harvest for two summers.

After the wheat harvest, Buehler taught in a country school in a thinly-populated area one and one-half miles from his home. The family he lived with had two children. They provided Ezra with a spring-wagon and two horses to drive to school each day. There were eighteen students who attended classes at the school. For his teaching, Ezra was paid $70.00 a month. (He also milked cows for his room and board during the school months.)

Late August 1915, Ezra headed back for his parents' home in Missouri to go back to college. He had been determined to pay his way through school, and it looked as if he had saved enough money to do just that. He recalled, "I was so proud; I had two new suits and $500.00 to become a college freshman."[12]

Buehler attended Central Wesleyan College, which was supported by the German Methodist Church and was the oldest college in Missouri. This institution originally had three basic functions: it provided teaching on the high school level (academy work); it taught on the college level; and it also took in orphans from the Civil War.

Ezra Buehler entered Central Wesleyan in 1915, and his major area of study was in sociology. He also took two years of private study in elocution. The instructors in this college were bilinguists of high quality.

Buehler participated in many activities at Central Wesleyan. These included play-acting, oratory, basketball, and intercollegiate athletics. He received letters in tennis,

baseball, and track. He once won the decathlon track meet.

Buehler was totally committed to pay his way through college. During the summer after his first year at Wesleyan, he took a job selling Fuller brushes in the farmland area near his parents' home. After two weeks at this job, he received notice that he had been selected to act as foreman for the Redpath Horner Traveling Chautauqua.

This was a miracle that was to bring the young Buehler life-enrichment in a personal and professional sense. He was to experience travel and make contact with upper-level country people all over the midwest--people hungry for enlightenment. This experience brought him in close touch with platform speakers, including William Jennings Bryan, Russell Conwell, Senator Robert La Follette, and others. Programs also included theatrical plays, bell ringers, band concerts, acts of magic, and many others.

Early during his second summer with the Chautauqua (between his sophomore and junior year at Central Wesleyan), Buehler served as "advance man" for the company. He traveled two weeks ahead of the Chautauqua to promote it. During his travels, he covered a seven-state area, from Texas to Wyoming. As the summer ended, he was promoted to the position of platform superintendent. It was at this point that Buehler's life ambition turned away from farming; he wanted something different. His aim was now to become a high school teacher. These were high hopes for a young man raised on the farm.

The young Buehler's junior year at Wesleyan was marked by mind-buckling episodes. He recalls, "A dark cloud hung over me. This cloud was created by the great war against Germany. I grew up in a German family, in a German-minded community. I was concerned how some of these people close to my family would feel about men being drafted from our

community."[13] Farmers and preachers were exempted from the draft. Out of eighteen cousins, Buehler was the only one in his family to submit to the draft. He felt there were too many students opposed to the war.

The Great War was the one single dynamo that motivated Buehler to enter the annual college oratorical contest with his own original oration, "The Welding of Humanity." He wrote this speech 13 times, giving up his Christmas vacation, before he generated the final outcome. There were seven contestants; he placed first. He then began preparation for the state of Missouri contest held in his hometown. This was a five-state competition. The audience was immense, and over 200 people had to be turned away from the church where the competition was held. Here, he placed second.

Then, for the next year and three months, Buehler had little control over his life...he was placed into the hands of the United States Military.

Ezra Buehler joined the United States Military Forces, May 27, 1918. Basic Training was at Fort Dodge, near Des Moines, Iowa. After two months at Fort Dodge, Buehler was transferred to New York by train. He was bound to board a ship, in a convoy of 11 ships, to journey for 13 days to London, England.

Once in London, they traveled on to Sherbourg, France, first by train, then by boat. They were now under the direction of the British. They moved around Paris, France, by rail, riding in horse boxcars called "8-40s." (This meant there was room for eight horses and forty men.[14]) Training was now geared for combat: guard duty, trench life, use of gas masks, bayonets, and hand grenades. Buehler recalls, "As we moved closer to the fighting lines, we could hear cannons in the distance. Our time was spent in the trenches midst the cooties, rats and rain."[15]

While the men were in training, they were plagued by a severe attack of the Spanish flu.

One morning, Buehler felt ill, not wanting to rise from his bed. He couldn't eat, and his fever was high. He packed his own bag and, carrying his own folding bed, walked a half mile to an emergency hospital located in a large storehouse. There were more than one hundred men lying on the floor of the barren place. There were no beds, no nurses...no facilities for those who were sick. That same night, Buehler watched as other men were carried from the storehouse, dead.

After almost two weeks, Buehler was back in service, joining those selected to capture the city of Metz, Germany. This specially-selected group of men were being trained to perform as shock troops. The training was rugged and harsh, but fortunately these shock troops were never used--thanks to the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

"Even after the Armistice, the Army was no pot of joy." Buehler later would recall,"The men had nothing to do for months; no place to go."[16] They attended various marching missions through areas of war battles. On these marches they witnessed the tragedy of war, passing by corpses on the ground.

Buehler experienced a lonely Thanksgiving and Christmas. The mail service was poor. "I didn't know that my Army sweetheart had died of the flu until five weeks after it happened," he recalls. "Those at home worried that I wouldn't return from the war. Yet she was at home, and when I returned, she was gone...the irony of it."[17]

Then, good luck found Buehler. He had been engaged by his sergeant to teach reading and writing to soldiers who were in need of it. Then, in mid-February 1918, he was chosen to attend a British university of his own choice. (Buehler was selected, one out of seventeen in his division and one out of 1,000 men, from the American Expeditionary Force.) Buehler chose Kings College and the London School of Economics in London, England.

At Kings College, Buehler experienced a glorious amount of learning. He visited museums, churches, traveled to Scotland, and was given the opportunity to meet English Royalty.

A few weeks after Buehler's honorable discharge, he returned to Wesleyan College for his senior year. Back in school, there was a vacuum in the unity of school spirit. The elements of the actual establishment were the same, but those who returned from the war had changed.

Buehler was selected to act as President of the Wesleyan Student Body. During this last year at Wesleyan, there was one incident which sparked trouble and, for some, would scar the remainder of the school year.

A graduating senior, also a member of the Army, was charged by the College Administration with smoking on campus. Because of this, he was to be expelled from the college. Being a smoker or non-smoker was not the issue. (Soldiers serving overseas had become accustomed to being served packages of cigarettes by the military.) There was sharp resistance to this administrative action by many of the other students. Those who were graduating were reluctant to speak out for fear they would also be expelled. The decision was made by all students to continue attending classes but to cease all attendance at extra-curricular activities; this included a ban on all intercollegiate basketball games. The shock was so compelling that the college board cancelled its order to expel the accused smoker! He graduated along with his class, as scheduled.[18]

After receiving his B.A. from Central Wesleyan College, May 1920, Buehler attended Cumnoch School of Oratory. He attended one year and received a Bachelor of Oratory. There were 63 in the graduating class, three men and sixty women.

After receiving his B.O. degree, he was offered teaching positions from ten different

colleges. Buehler chose to teach at Hamline University, located in St. Paul, Minnesota. He taught one year at Hamline, then chose to return to Northwestern University to get his graduate degree.

After serving as an assistant instructor at Northwestern as a graduate student, he was invited to teach for three consecutive summers. (These were private lessons.) He went on to complete his Master's in Oral Interpretation. In 1923, he became the first student to earn a Master's Degree from Northwestern's School of Speech. One single oration in the spring of 1918 had opened the door for his professional life. "This oration, 'The Welding of Humanity', in the local and state of Missouri College contest brought me honorary membership in three National Forensic Honor societies: Delta Sigma Rho, Tau Kappa Alpha, and Beta Sigma Phi."[19] He served as the National President of Delta Sigma Rho from 1942 until 1952 and was Director of Forensics in three universities for an accumulation of 42 years. Professor Buehler held his first teaching assignment at Hamline University in 1921, and moved to Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas, in 1923. After coaching the Washburn debate team to victory over the K.U. law students in 1925, he was hired by the University of Kansas Speech Department and has spent the remainder of his life in Lawrence. Professor Buehler has had a long and distinguished career of over 46 years of teaching. His "students" haven't been restricted to the college campus but have come from business and professional fields as well.

Professor Buehler's contributions in the classroom, to business and professional speech training, in writing speech texts, directing forensics and debate, and in his leadership in professional organizations are considerable. He has been instrumental in the development of speech education in this country, as well as at the University of Kansas.

## Notes

1 Interview with Professor Buehler, March 1981.

2 Interview, April 1981.

3 Interview, May 1981.

4 Interview, March 1981.

5 Buehler, E. C. "High School--Another World." (1980) p. 1.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid., p. 2.

8 Interview, June 1981.

9 Buehler, E. C. "High School--Another World." (1980) p. 2.

10 Buehler, E. C. "High School--Another World." (1980) p. 3.

11 Interview, August 1981.

12 Interview, August 1981.

13 Interview, August 1981.

14 Interview, September 1981.

15 Interview, September 1981.

16 Interview, September 1981.

17 Interview, September 1981.

18 Interview, October 1981.

19 Interview, March 1981.

## HAPPINESS IS

Happiness is to tie your shoe laces for the first time, to jump off the diving board, to bake your first cake, to get your first driver's license.

Happiness is to hear the honk of wild geese, to find the first violet in the Spring, to feel one particular sunset after seeing a hundred others, to hear a forest praying.

Happiness is to enjoy the laughter of children, to feel the handclasp of a friend, to find kindness and gratitude where you least expect it.

Happiness is to know you are wanted in the family, the school room, on the playground.

Happiness is to find peace of mind, peace in the home, community, country.

Happiness is to be at home and feel at home, to have a home that will make you homesick when you are away.

Happiness is to discover that you are your Brother's Keeper.

Happiness is to discover that you are what you are, because others have practiced the way of "being your Brother's Keeper" on you.

Happiness is something for which you search like the Holy Grail. It is something you create that is all yours. Best of all, happiness is made of the stuff that feeds on itself to produce a greater abundance of its kind.

## SECTION II

# THE PROFESSIONAL IDEAS OF E. C. BUEHLER

# CHAPTER ONE

## Reflections on the History of the Speech Profession

## TALKING TO MYSELF

("The President's Page" reprinted from
The Gavel, May 1952, Vol.34, No. IV)

When I was a small boy on a Nebraska farm, I spent many hours talking to myself. In this way, I was accountable to no one for what I said. It was a comforting, harmless way to pass the time. Sometimes it made me feel better to have a chat with myself.

For some time now, I have had the urge to say something about my profession but have had no definite listeners in mind. The thought occurred to me, why not have it out with myself on The President's Page? So, Dear Reader, if by chance you should happen to be perusing these lines, I beg you to feel free to go no further, for this is not for you--I just want to talk to myself.

I am a speech teacher by accident. I stumbled into this field. At first, I had my eye on the pulpit. Then the first Big War came and, after fighting more than a year "to make the world safe for democracy," disillusionment and inner conflicts strained the moorings that a sheltered farm life and Sunday School had established. My senior year in college was a turbulent one for my inner self. The little Methodist college had more than its share of troubles due to its German constituency, shaky financial support, and the revolutionary spirit within its own student body. Before receiving my diploma, I had many serious talks with myself and decided that if I could not earnestly pursue the call of the ministry, maybe I could be a platform reader, or an actor, or, as a last resort, I could be a teacher. I reasoned, "Why not go to the Cumnoch School of Oratory at Northwestern University and see what will happen?" That's what I did. Then followed one of the most exciting and fruitful years of my life. There in Annie May Swift Hall, within a stone's throw

of the beautiful waters of Lake Michigan, I found myself under the sympathetic and inspirational guidance of Professor Lew Sarett. There was born within me a new confidence in all those elements that go to make human character. Inwardly, there was an awakening; I learned the language of the heart and soul. There grew within me a sense of appreciation of beauty wherever it was found, whether it be in poetry, drama, oratory, song, prayer, or the starry heavens. My speech classes concerned the art of living as much as the art of speaking. Above all, there was that sense of belonging, of being somebody. Summed up, this spelled faith in myself, and it brought me much personal happiness. This experience of being born again in a speech class through the influence of an understanding, inspirational teacher did not take place during the impressionable age of 13 or 16. I was 27 years old.

Now, my life's work was cut out for me. I was going to be a speech teacher and help others find themselves. At the end of the year, I had a dozen offers to teach speech, all at the college level. I accepted a position at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota. In the following year I returned to Northwestern to receive the first Master's Degree in Speech offered by that institution. Now, as I look back, I am dumbfounded at the terrific growth and development which has taken place in our field. At that time I could count the schools offering an M. A. in speech on the fingers of my left hand. Now, over a hundred schools offer advanced degrees. There were only 350 members in our national speech association. Now, there are nearly 5,000. There were only two or three textbooks of merit for the foundation course; now, there are scores of books for the beginning courses. Where there was one teacher of speech, or one speech student, now there are twenty. Where there was but one magazine, there are now three major publications and a score of minor ones. There were only three main fields of study: oral interpretation, public speaking, and drama. Now, there are over a dozen. Such terms as

radio, television, semantics, socio-drama, group-dynamics were not part of our nomenclature. And the end of our growth and expansion still is not in sight.

I relate this story of the miraculous growth of our profession, not in a boastful spirit, but rather in the spirit of astonishment and humility. For, in the sweep of these terrific developments, I am wondering if we may not be losing certain worthwhile goals and objectives. I have been disturbed about what is happening to the quality of the speaking performance of our students, both in and out of the classroom, and I am disturbed about our attitude or lack of attitude towards the individual student as a human being. First, what about the quality of the speaking performance? It seems to me we have gone overboard seeking informality, naturalness, and spontaneity, and we are getting indifference, too much casualness, and considerable sloppiness. We, too, have been caught in the post-war trends towards science and scientific methods. We have succumbed to charts, diagrams, mechanical measuring devices, and the like. I hear about a three-hour beginning course which requires only three short speeches during a whole semester. I hear about students who spend hours on preparing intricate charts of the voice mechanism or studying hours on diacritical works, transcribing phonetic symbols, and submitting to a battery of objective quizzes. Is this the way to learn how to talk before a group? What chance would a young Patrick Henry, Abraham Lincoln, or Robert Ingersoll have with this sort of initial speech training?

What about the quality of our platform performance in the extra-curricular field? Professor Bower Aly, recent president of the Speech Association of America, was widely quoted in the public press as having said that "Oratory in America is at a new low." College oratory had its decline. The oration, the aristocrat of all forensic events, should represent the finest creative writing and polished oral expression that the individual can master. I recall my awkward, crude, but cou-

rageous attempt at college oratory in which ten percent of the student body participated. There were two sets of judges, one for composition, one for delivery. My masterpiece of 2,000 words was rewritten and revised 13 times, and the effort cost me my Christmas vacation--with the contest, mind you, still seven weeks away. Today, the college orator thinks he is doing wonders if he can write something on a subject a week before the scheduled event.

We do obtain a certain kind of performance in our contest debates, but this kind of performance is hardly suitable for most audience situations. Our debaters are so geared for the tournament performance that it takes the debaters from England, who have never had a speech course or a debate coach, to show us how to talk to an audience.

Public speaking is basically an art, not a science. It is an art comprising many intangibles which spring from the human equation and which encompass spiritual values not designed for submission to slide-rule or mechanical device.

In a speech class we deal first, last and always with human stuff. The individual is the all-important end product; therefore, a speech class should be student-centered. Speech is the total personality functioning at its best in a group situation. Yet, we see speech classes which are centered around a teacher, a textbook, a methodology or a segment of a curriculum. True eloquence must first come from the person. To smother and stifle this primitive source of effectiveness is to fail in the essentials of teaching speech.

This brings me to the kernel of what I want to say to myself. Performance and the individual are inseparable; they are intricately bound together in a unique, artistic creation called a speech. Through performance we can best reach the individual and through the individual we can best gain good performance. One complements the other. Here are the two basic needs of the large

majority of the students who come to our classes. In questionnaire after questionnaire, it has been revealed that the students in the beginning courses want and need, first, self-assurance and, second, the ability to speak well before a group. We build and cultivate those elements which make up the human personality through wisely-guided practice sessions in speech-making. We also get our best speaking performance when those individualistic talents and personal attributes of the speaker are blended with content and speaking techniques to give the best artistic product. Let us not forget that first of all the person talks. Good speaking is the communication of thought which has the personality of the speaker wrapped around it. This may be old stuff, but I keep forgetting it. That is why I thought it would be a good thing if I talked to myself about it.

And so, Dear Reader, if this has bored you, remember you were fairly warned. You didn't have to read this.

## SOME REFLECTIONS

(Address to the 1963 Kansas Speech Association Convention, Hays, Kansas, presented May 4. Introduction by Bobby R. Patton.)

"I said facetiously a few minutes ago that we have a newcomer seated with us at the head table. Actually, Professor E. C. "Bill" Buehler came to Kansas just 40 years ago. He was Chairman of the Department of Speech and Director of Forensics at Washburn University for two years, and he's been at the University of Kansas for the past 38 years. While at the University of Kansas, he's been deeply concerned in three areas of the speech teaching profession: first, he's been involved in forensics; second, in speech communication for business and industry; and third, he's dealt with problems in the teaching of the fundamentals of speech in college. For the past seven years Prof. Buehler has been in charge of the Basic Course at the University of Kansas, which has an enrollment of over 1,000 pupils each semester. Some of us from out-of-state first recognized the name of Professor Buehler as the author of eighteen high school debate handbooks. He is also the author or co-author of four speech books. He's contributed articles to The Speech Teacher, the Quarterly Journal of Speech, and to all of the regional journals. He's been an officer in Delta Sigma Rho for nearly 30 years; its president for 11 years. He served as Executive Secretary of the Missouri Valley Forensic League for 25 years. He's organized 112 speech classes for adults. He was technical advisor for 11 speech education films and served as a lecturer and consultant on the subject of communication and human relations for numerous business organizations. Professor Buehler did his graduate work at Northwestern University, Columbia University, the London School of Economics, and the University of Kansas. He was one of four to receive the first M. A. degree in Speech

from Northwestern in 1923. In his own words, he says that he was a country boy, who started for the pulpit, made a left turn to the stage door, came to his senses, and became a speech teacher and has never had a moment of regret. He claims he has never been bored or known a dull moment in his chosen profession. I think quite appropriately his topic for us this afternoon is going to be, after 40 years, 'Some Reflections'. Professor E. C. Buehler."

**********

Mr. President, colleagues, students, friends. After that introduction, for a moment I wished that I could hear this speech myself. I think I'll use his title. I might confess that when I received the letter from Bobby Patton some weeks ago my heart jumped with joy. I was so tickled and so pleased that I was embarrassed, and I knew that I was blushing. But I jumped at the chance. I said, "Yes," just like an old maid. I didn't know, however, what I might be getting into. But since I have never been asked to speak to this group before, I assure you this is my maiden speech. And if the schedule will be continued on this basis and my turn won't come for another 40 years, I assure you this is probably the last time that I will be invited to make this speech. But please don't think that this is going to be a farewell speech. Also, I intend to stick around for quite awhile and attend some of your meetings. Furthermore, there is nothing in the book on how to make a maiden speech and a farewell speech all at the same time.

Yes, I was a Sunday School boy, and when the word "forty" comes to my mind I begin to think of some Biblical allusions. There were 40 years in which the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness towards the Promised Land. And there was the prophet of gloom, Jeremiah, who went through the streets of Nineveh with his six-word oration: 40 days, 40 nights, Nineveh will be destroyed. And of course there's Noah, who built an ark so he could withstand 40 days and 40 nights of rain, which I'm sure we Kansans could appreciate a

little. And then there's John the Baptist, who spent 40 days in the wilderness fasting to cleanse and strengthen his soul.

Now you students of rhetoric, please note that these introductory remarks have nothing to do with my central theme. And you students of rhetorical theory, please observe that this is an example of a speaker who is engaged in mental stalling--mental doodling. He's reaching for equilibrium. And the morals you may see in these Biblical allusions may be the hand of the Lord who is trying to punish the evil in men and bless the good that's in them.

Now, as a matter of history, I know it's a little tricky to use history to get a point across. History has its limitations. Henry Ford had no use for it; yet he couldn't build a Ford without it. Carl Sandburg said that history is nothing but a bucket of ashes. Now if we really accept this, I don't think this is fair to our grandparents. I like to use the philosopher's point of view. A philosopher asks, "How can you get light for the path on which you are moving forward?" and, "How can you see where you are unless you look from whence you came?"

So what was Speech Education like 40 years ago? Well, first look at the environment. The college boys and girls danced the Charleston, and coonskin coats were in vogue. Men wore vests, and they wore garters. And the women, the well-to-do and the fashionable, wore silk hose; others wore cotton stockings. And cigarette smoking among women--un-unh, no-o-o-o-o, that was still a sin. Lipstick, if you used lipstick, caused eyebrows to go up. But you could use rouge if you used it with discretion. How did school children get to school? They walked or rode streetcars. And the Chautauqua and the Lyceum were still going strong. And the homes were without radios. And then when you went cross-country, you went in a Model T. This was the model. They sold Fords by this one slogan: "Gets you there, gets you back." There were no paved roads from

the standpoint of state systems or the federal system.

But what about the speech teaching profession? The professional awareness was just beginning to emerge. The word "empathy" had not appeared. The word "discussion," if you found it in a textbook, meant the body of a brief. And, if you heard the word "feedback," you'd probably go to the barnyard and ask a farmer what it meant. And if you heard the word "communication," you'd think of telephone wires. And if you heard the word "semantic," you'd reach for a dictionary. And if you heard the word "listen," you'd say, "Oh, that's one of the five senses." And it was looked upon something like you look upon snoring. It's something that you just do naturally. It certainly isn't anything you can teach.

What about departments of speech? There were none. There were departments of Public Speaking, of Expression, of Elocution, and of Oral English. And what about debate tournaments? There were none. There were no general topics, and if you debated both sides of the question, you were taking a calculated ethical risk. You wouldn't think of having a public debate without having some musical numbers. I'll read to you from the bulletin of the Kansas Debate League: "Strive to popularize debate by introducing musical and other features into the program, making the people feel that they have received more of value than the necessary fee to cover expenses." Oratory was king among forensics. This was the aristocrat of all events. I attended a college where ten percent of the student body went out for oratory.

A few decades earlier special trains were organized and chartered to go from one school to another to the seat of conflict. Victories were celebrated with street dances and bonfires. Let me read to you a story from the Lawrence Journal-World in the late 1890s. "The State Oratorical Contest took place last Friday night in Topeka. KU was represented by a large delegation. Many of our boys, fearing they

would not be there in time, went Thursday morning, and every train that left Lawrence from then until Friday night carried university students. By 8:00 pm the Grand Opera House was nearly filled with college students from various parts of the state, and the yelling began. The KU delegation was too much scattered to get in their best work, but we had the advantage of the best yell. And the Rock Chalk could be heard above the din."

Well, those were some of the good old days. Now, even in my day, the contests on the constitution were held by some of the high schools. This was in some ways a horrendous affair. I recall coaching a boy from Phillipsburg by the name of Phil Bramwell, and we were trying to get him ready for the divisional or sectional contest in Kansas City. And the first prize--this wasn't for national--was $500. I coached him with the understanding that if he won we would share the prize money. If he lost, he owed me nothing. Well, it was a great event. The convention hall was packed to the rafters, and who were the judges? Five state governors. When the final decision came out I had one of those spontaneous releases. I had just purchased a brand new straw hat, paid $1.65 for it. It was a "sailor." And when my boy won, I let out a shout of great joy, and I released my "sailor." It sailed clear across the convention hall, never to return. I'd like to suggest, may those glorious days never return, because we developed prima donnas among the orators and ulcers among the coaches.

Now, take a look at the Kansas oratory outside the academic circle; the picture is fairly bleak. Two names stand out: Senator Jim Lane and Senator John Engles, and there were contrasts in each. Jim Lane was one of those rough-and-ready men. He had a magnetic personality, and he was disgustingly gifted with dramatic imagination. One of the historians said that he spoke with every pore of his skin. Senator John Engles was just the opposite. He was the quiet type, the gentleman, and the scholar; he represented seasoned judgment. He was three times elected and was the first

Kansas Senator to be honored in the Hall of Fame with a statue in the outer room of the United States Senate. There were a few minor figures such as Charles Curtis and Governor Henry Allen, However, when we look at the academic cirle, the history is much more glorious.

Kansas has the second oldest high school debate league in the nation. It was organized in 1910. And for a time in the early '30s from 160 to 200 high schools were active in the league. This was about four times as many as now. However, since the squads are much larger than they were then, we probably had about as many participating.

Kansas was the birthplace of the college forensic tournament. Dr. J. Thompson Baker, Chairman of the Department at Southwestern College, is known as the "Father of the Debate Tournament." The first tournament was held just 40 years ago in the spring of 1923 with 185 debate teams from 57 colleges, and there were a total of 500 debaters and about 500 debates. You can imagine what kind of a pandemonium that would be to have a debate tournament of this dimension without previous experience. And you guessed it; it was to some extent a wild, woolly, and almost bloody affair. It lasted until 3:30 on Sunday morning. There were two instances of fainting. One girl fainted when she heard that her team won--she never fainted again. One of the boys in the final debate fainted from fatigue, and that school lost by default. But from the standpoint of quantity and length of continued existence, the Southwestern Tournament is the foremost in the nation.

By the same criteria, the junior college tournament held at St. Johns in the same city must be given top laurels. Much of the early leadership of the Phi Kappa Delta movement rests in our state. Washburn College was the first host to the Phi Kappa Delta national convention in 1917. As early as 1923, there were 11 chapters of Phi Kappa Delta in Kansas; this was more than ten percent of the entire

national chapter role. The Missouri Valley Forensic League, now composed of 13 larger universities of the Missouri Valley and probably the oldest large forensic league of such eminence in the nation, owes its existence to the initiative, the drive, and the leadership of one Harry K. Summers from Kansas State. He was the Thomas Jefferson of the league. He prepared an instrument. He whipped out a constitution which was finally the basis that brought this league into being.

I believe that on a per capita basis, Kansas probably outranks all other states in extra-curricular speech activity when you combine both high schools and colleges. Now for a period of five years, the West Point tournament had on an average of two Kansas schools per year. This is a record surpassed only by the larger states of Texas and California. I recall in 1952, out of 16 debaters in the quarter-finals at West Point, seven were former Kansas high school debaters. During the first twenty years of the Missouri Valley, first place honors in oratory and extemp were captured by Kansas schools. I have it on good rumors and also by many great fine routes, that Hutchinson has won more national honors among the junior colleges than any other institution.

Now, who are the men and women who contributed to this era? Some of them cast a long shadow. I know it's rather hazardous to bear a role call, but among the touted group are: J. D. Fellsman of Pittsburgh, R. E. Ritchie of Ottawa, E. A. Leach of Baker, J. Thompson Baker of Southwestern, E. A. Harbison of the University of Wichita, and Maurice Hess. (I might say Hess is from McPherson, and he was known not only as a debate coach but as a man that would not compromise a principle. He chose the federal penitentiary to stand by his principle as a conscientious objector to serving as a soldier in World War I.) Martin J. Holcomb, James R. Stark of our Kansas State College or K-State College, and George R. Pflaum for his leadership in forensics, Pflaum was one of the pioneers in developing programs in speech correction; F. L. Gilson made his

imprint upon the state with the Gilson Players, and Howard T. Hill for his excellent work in oratory and, of course, his extensive public relations work on behalf of speech at Kansas State; Forest Whan was in the area of radio and television at Wichita and Kansas State, Harry Summers, G. A. Pullman of St. Johns, Allen Crafton, of my own university, where he is working in theatre; Margaret Anderson, for her sustained interest in developing the standards of the beginning speech course and pioneering work in speech correction.

Among the high schools and junior colleges, we must give heed to Alma Moore of Newton, Edmund J. Maer of Topeka, Hazel Shamlepper of Wichita East, Edith Yokums of Rosedale High School, and Leonard Jensen of Wyandotte. Then we come to a group of men, and I tried to select those who go back more than 25 years. I can't skip the break line here, and therefore I will pay tribute to Matt Hill of Topeka, Dan Tewell of Pittsburg, Maurice Swanson of Shawnee Mission, and Tom Kelly of Hutchinson.

Now the success and triumphs of these people has been handed to us on a platter, and without them we would not be here. Sometimes we think that probably they did something that was a little stupid. That might be true, but these were not stupid people. They made mistakes, and we have profited by their errors.

Now what great changes have occurred in 40 years? Perhaps the overshadowing fact lies in the road to expansion, especially at the college level. Student population increased with sort of an explosion. Fundamentals of Speech was made a requirement. The number of courses and faculty more than quadrupled. Speech majors were introduced almost across the board and the graduate programs followed. In the revolutionary sweep, other areas had been taken into our order: radio-television, discussion, forms of group interaction, group dynamics, phonetics, semantics, communication theory, listening theory, research methods, and a maze of specialty courses in rhetorical theory, theatre and drama, radio-television, and the

sciences applied to speech and hearing behavior.

Since World War II, I might point out, there were three significant developments which had an impact upon our field. First is the widespread movement to make one course a requirement for college graduation. I suspect that in the state of Kansas 70 to 75% of the students face this requirement, and across the nation this percentage was about, according to Franklin Knower, 55%. Second is the impact of atomic energy and the Sputniks upon the sciences. This marks a sharp shift away from the humanities. And third is the emergence of communication concepts both as concerns speech skills and communication theory. Thus, this gives us the impetus for the language arts programs, particularly at the high school level and a revision of our attitudes towards speech as a tool of communication.

Philosophically speaking, communication concepts represent a sort of an overlaid function to the skill courses. Now we were beginning to ask, "Was he communicating?" instead of asking, "Was this an effective speech?" I understand that this particular program is now being ticketed. But I would suspect that in ten years from now, those who listen to this will certainly get a very different communication impact from what you people get here. It is entirely possible that ten years from now when we look at speech performance, we may look at it in a role which is of much less importance than now. The overall communication impact, according to communication theory, will lie in many other areas.

Speech is now a widely accepted and firmly established academic discipline. We now belong. Now we have a respectable image in an academic environment. However, in the process of attaining this academic respectability, I suspect we may have sacrificed standards in speech-making performance, knowledge about speech theory. The ability to critically evaluate a speech does not always mean high level proficiency in speaking and listening. I would

like to suggest that the weight of my professional conscience shows the pendulum is in danger of swinging too far. We should remember that the anchor point for the establishment of speech departments rests with the utilitarian or the functional aspects of speech. Directed speaking experience before a group is the basic training that is necessary for responsible leadership of our youth.

So how can we teach English without composition? How can we teach chemistry without a laboratory? How can we teach mathematics without blackboards and paper? How can you teach one to swim if somebody doesn't get wet? And how can you teach speech without using your tongue? The revolutionary changes in speech at the high school level have not been so great. Their speech is generally a selected course. Ten years ago six percent of our high school students across the state took speech courses. Oscar Haugh thinks that the percentage now has gone up to about nine percent. However, we have had a very encouraging growth in speech emphasis outside of the regular curricular work in the speech festivals. Of course many of us feel that this isn't enough. But my position is that it is better to have a poor show than no show at all.

So I come to you now and I ask you a question. You speech teachers and some of your students, I ask you this question: "Where and when did you have that moment that gave you your deepest satisfaction?" First, as a teacher; second, as a student. You don't need to answer; I already know the answer. Your finest hour as a student was that moment in a debate tournament or in an important debate when you came through and achieved the goal. And you had the satisfaction of doing it. Or at that moment in an oratorical contest or in a speech class, where your great moment of satisfaction came when you did it. You teachers have your finest moments when a student unexpectedly flowers and unfolds and crashes through a new seed of personality for you. Somehow, there is another experience of

self-renewal--a type of self-discovery. These are your finest hours.

And now I have a point, and I have a way in which I want to reinforce this point. I think I had better tell you a story. I was walking along in Strong Hall about two weeks ago with our Registrar James K. Hitt. We dropped by some of his classrooms and observed some of the math teachers at work. We noticed they used the blackboard and used a lot of diagrams, and I said to James K., "Can you tell me how a math teacher can teach without a blackboard?" He kind of smiled, "Well, I suppose they need it." And I said, "I've always been interested in math because my oldest daughter majored in math." Then Mr. Hitt told me the story about U. G. Mitchell, who for about two decades was head of the math department at the University of Kansas. He had the reputation of being one the finest classroom craftsmen on the hill. Some of the colleagues of Mr. Mitchell would badger him and say, "U. G., c'mon tell us what's your secret?" His answer was usually something like this: "Aw shucks, I can't teach math; no one can teach math. We don't teach these people math. All we do, is use mathematics as a means by which we teach people." And there you have it. Now I realize that this is a rather idealistic interpretation. My point is oversimplified and here, Mr. President, I must pause and ask you to give me leave so I may scratch a moral itch. The only way to scratch it is to talk. Ladies and gentlemen of this convention, I see a new role of importance for the speech teacher in our culture and in our free society.

As you all know, we are now in the throes of a revolution, particularly in the area of science, machines, gadgets, and material things. We have, as a nation, been hit hardest of any nation on earth. We have been struck a blow in the solar plexis. We have the railroads, the automobiles, the airplanes, the iceboxes, the telephones, the pills--sleeping pills included. We have the machines, the skyscrapers, the gadgets. We also have the surpluses. And while we are in the midst of

milk and honey, we are spoiling on the inside. Due to the pressures, turmoils, tensions, and emotional frictions, we haven't learned how to take it. I just read yesterday morning in the Kansas City Times the number one story that the Menninger Clinic released the figure that 17,000,000 people in the United States are going to need care for their minds. It was pointed out that one out of every ten people in this country would sometime need attention because of mental illness. I know when I say one out of ten, I can see some of you count. I look at this table, and I know some of this will happen up here. This article also points out that four and one half million are alcoholics. And although this article didn't bring this up, I have many sources for these statistics that we can outrank homes by divorce 4 to 1 over our friends in the free world. We can out-crime Europe 11 to 1. And when it comes to Nobel prizes, they out-run us, on a per capita basis, 6 to 1. Chinese communists say, "Give us the Americans. They are the easiest of all to brainwash."

So I ask here in the midst of plenty and freedom, why should we look at some facts of this type? I think basically that life, as many years suggest, is a matter of human understanding, which in our language is a matter of effective communication. So our concern should be more with humanities lest we continue to act like frustrated adolescents. About two weeks ago on the campus of Kansas State, the head of the English Department, Mr. Howard Bunkle Jones, made a speech. I was interested in some of his observations. He pointed out there are four forces in our culture today: (1) Science, (2) Government and Laws, (3) Church, and (4) Field of Humanities. He suggested that science was very much in the saddle. That government and laws were here with us, and little by little we have to give away a little more of our freedom. He also suggested that the church was weak as a force for moral suasion, but there was real hope in developing some breadth and depth study in fitting appreciation of what humanities means. His definition was one word--humanities oriented around human dignity.

The centrifugal force of our discipline lies in the field of humanities, and so I believe that a debater, who learns both sides of the question, soon learns to know that there is more than one side and sometimes there may be half a dozen sides. This is broadening.

I believe that when we develop concepts in rhetorical theory and communication theory, we're doing something which will stand as a bulwark against bigotry, against dogmatism, and the psychology of plagiarism and demagoguery. I believe that as we help the students to think without confusion, we are also helping them to function intelligently. And I believe that as we help groups to make decisions more effectively and more wisely by our methods of handling discussion, we are contributing to the humanities. And I believe that a student who has a potential for being a good man will become a better man when he faces the challenge to share himself and his ideas before a group. In other words, I think his better nature probably has a better chance to come out before a group than his bad nature would before a group. On these bases I think we have a role heading our modern culture, and our new day takes on a new dimension of importance and significance.

And you speech teachers, you deal intimately with human stuff. You deal intimately with people, and these people are samples of the masterpiece of the creative process. As Charles Laughton would say, "Thus endeth my story."

# REFLECTIONS IN A PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL SENSE

(Reprinted from Speaker and Gavel,
January 1964, Vol. 1, #2)

## I

## IN A PERSONAL SENSE

Teaching must have been my calling, for I found the abundant life in the classroom. I have been teaching speech for more than 40 years, 39 at K. U. I have also taught in various speech communication programs for more than 200 groups in business and industry. I have coached or directed hundreds of college orators and debaters for competitive forensic events. I am sure, if there were such a thing as a speechometer, the totals would register more than 300,000 speeches heard.

I can hear some of my readers say, "Poor Professor, how dull and boring a life he must have had! I can't even stay awake in church listening to the preacher!" On the contrary, I have never known a dull or boring moment, never dreaded meeting my classes. It has all been immensely exciting, and even now I find it more enjoyable than ever. But there is really nothing mysterious about this exuberance, for I come in close touch with people and deal intimately and realistically with them.

There is something about the individual personality which is appealing to most of us. Woodrow Wilson once said, "The most exciting thing in all the world is the human personality." The point is that speech is a reflection and manifestation of the human personality in action. Many of us will stand for minutes on end, as if spellbound, before an iron cage in a zoo to watch monkeys go through their antics. I, too, am a monkey-watcher, but I wouldn't care for monkey-watching as a steady diet, day after day. For me, it is much more exciting and interesting to observe people, the

masterpieces of the creative process--to observe the antics of the human mind as mirrored by the spoken word.

Moreover, it is especially rewarding and gratifying to observe the personalities of students flower and unfold before my very eyes, to see them experience a kind of self-renewal and self-discovery as they share their attitudes and ideas orally with their peers. Speech-making, in its essence, is a social experience; and most people, be they college freshmen or company executives, are driven by a deep sense of pride to show the better side of their nature when talking before a group. The ego becomes deeply involved, and this generates the great and common bugaboo of public speakers: stage fright. Speakers have to learn how to live with it, but they soon come to recognize it as something to control, not to get rid of. While a student is in mild shock, he isn't himself; frankly, he isn't all there. He must learn how to adjust himself, to gain the self-assurance and personal equilibrium which he must have for his best mental alertness and his most persuasive manner.

Once he gets this feeling of self-mastery when standing before a group, the student experiences a new sense of achievement which carries over into everything he does. An example or two will explain what I mean:

A senior girl dropped by my office only a few days ago to express her appreciation for what happened to her in a speech class three years ago when she was a timid freshman. She spoke of how this one class helped her through her entire college life; it made her studies in other courses easier and more enjoyable, helped her in her conferences with her teachers, helped her get along better with other students but, most important of all, it helped her to live with herself.

I received a Christmas card a year ago with a postmark from a South American country. The card read, in part, "Professor, you won't remember me but I was a student in your speech

class in Green Hall in 1930. I want to wish you a Merry Christmas and tell you that you opened a window for me for which I have forever been grateful. Sincerely, C. A.".

These are not isolated instances. They are typical of scores of similar responses, and I do not mention them in a boastful manner. I am embarrassingly pleased and humbled by such responses. They come from both college students and middle-aged men and women, who were in adult speech classes in business and industry. I have heard countless testimonies from the lips of high school teachers, especially debate coaches, about similar experiences among their students.

This all makes sense to me, for it strikes a responsive chord in my nature. This is exactly what happened to me in speech classes at Northwestern University as a gradute student when I was a grown man 27 years old. It was like being born again. This experience in self-renewal or self-discovery is the beginning of a new life with a new set of values, new capacities to appreciate the arts, new vision and insights for the pursuit of happiness. One's whole personality seems to have more room in which to move. Here lie some of the richest rewards of a teacher, not only the teacher of speech but of mathematics, of biology, of architecture, and so on.

The late U. G. Mitchell, one-time chairman of the Department of Mathematics at K.U., gave us a clue to the secret. When his colleagues begged him to tell his secret for his outstanding success as a classroom teacher, his reply was: "Heavens sake, we don't teach mathematics; no one can teach math; we just teach people." Ah, there you have it. We can't teach debate or oratory or public speaking; as we teach the man, the whole man with his many-sided personality, the skills in the oral communication process will find their natural orbit.

The strange thing is that there is nothing new about this. The ancient Greeks and Romans

practiced this nearly three thousand years ago. The Greeks made much of the inscription on their temples, "Know thyself." This is part of it, yes, but the more important part of it is to make thyself worth knowing. In this age of sputniks and heavy emphasis upon science and materialism, we need more than ever to tap those sources that build humanity in man. Herein lie the real makings of the civilized world.

## II

## IN A PROFESSIONAL SENSE

Speech-teaching as a profession was born in America just fifty years ago. The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking, formed in 1914 with a membership of 165, has grown beyond the 25,000 mark, counting memberships in theatre arts, speech and hearing, and radio broadcasters. When I became identified with the profession, scarcely a half-dozen universities offered majors in speech. Advanced degrees were almost unknown. In fact, I received the first M.A. degree in speech ever offered by Northwestern University, in 1923. Today more than 200 colleges offer the M.A., and 50 have programs for the Ph.D. More than a thousand departments of speech graduate 6,000 majors annually. A fundamental speech course, along with English composition, is commonly required among most colleges west of the Ohio Valley. At K. U. more than a thousand students are enrolled each semester in the beginning course, taught by a staff of 36 instructors. We have witnessed a far greater growth in speech education during the past 50 years than we have seen in the preceding 3,000 years.

This is decidedly an American phenomenon. There are numerous nations in our Western culture among whose universities one cannot find a single speech course in the curriculum. Emphasis upon speech as an academic discipline is a natural outgrowth of our culture. We are the children of the spirit of revolt, of revolt

against tyranny. The words "Liberty or death" have been on the lips of every schoolboy since the Declaration of Independence. Free speech is the lifeblood of democracy. The Constitution gave freedom of speech the "go" sign. It made free speech the law of the land. A new nation, conceived in liberty, facing new frontiers, new opportunities, new private enterprises, new social and political issues, had much need for talk to shape its manifest destiny. And talk there was--in shops, churches, schools, townhalls, legislative chambers, Chautauqua tents, and open-air platforms. Probably no nation since the time of the ancient Greeks has enjoyed such a rich heritage in oral rhetoric as we.

It must seem paradoxical to the layman that in this country, where speech education flourishes, we should witness such a sharp decline in public oratory. The rhetoric of the platform seems to hit a new low, year after year. But this does not distress me, for the methods and styles of speech-making have changed drastically. There has been a revolution in methods and kinds of speech-making. The one great single underlying influence for this is embodied in the concept, communication. "Did he get the message?" is the phrase heard most often. "The occasions for Websterian oratory are few, and the men capable of it still fewer," says Norman Thomas.

Speech-making has become everybody's business. It is no longer reserved for the lawyer, the preacher, the politician, and the college president. The merchant, the housewife, the farmer, all kinds of citizens must be articulate. On a per capita basis, there is ten times as much speech-making done now as in Webster's day. W. J. Bryan's oratory would probably be as much out of style today as high-buttoned shoes and celluloid collars. Speeches today are tailored to fit the clock. As an eighth-grader, I heard Senator Robert La Follette speak at a Chautauqua meeting, and he spoke for three and one-half hours. This was about par for the course. Not only are speeches today much shorter and more to the

point, but they are also more informal, more direct, more conversational, and much more communicative.

Revolutionary methods of teaching speech have swept into the college classroom. In some classrooms, "delivery" has almost become a dirty word. Personally, I feel the pendulum has swung too far towards efforts to downgrade the role of delivery. Too many speakers with worthwhile ideas fail to get their message across because of poor delivery. Of course, the overriding goal still is to develop more able speakers and listeners, but the mastery of speaking and listening skills as such is only one phase of the speech communication discipline. Sharing and energizing worthwhile ideas, knowledge and insight into speech theory, sound methods of research, and especially critical thinking in a responsible speech philosophy have become the "warp and woof" of the beginning speech course. A class that does not help the student toward more functional intelligence is a failure. Learning to speak means learning to think.

Research shows that students who take the beginning speech course as freshmen make better grades later in college than those who do not take the course. The student's mind is activated to look for what makes sound sense in speech; mental skills thus become more important than mere bodily and vocal expression. Listeners are taught to ask of the speaker: "What do you mean?"; "Why is this so?"; "Why do you care?"; "Why should I believe what you say?"; "Why should I care?". Since speech can be a dangerous, harmful weapon for social control, (as well as a useful, beneficial one) we need more minds able to search for truth and reveal it with integrity. For truth is ultimately the stuff from which wisdom must be fashioned.

## HISTORY AND TRENDS IN SPEECH EDUCATION

(Presented in Spring of 1965
at the University of Texas)

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to digress for a moment to tell you how glad I am to be here as a Visiting Professor at the University of Texas--the Harvard of the West. When I first received the letter from Wayne Thompson inviting me to come, I, of course, was embarrassingly pleased and flattered. My personal and professional ties with this department and the University are of long-standing. Back in the late '20s, when I was working on debate handbooks, the names of E. A. Shirter and Roy Bedecheck were almost household terms. I was a close friend of Elwood Griscom. We were both bowling enthusiasts and managed a few games at Missouri Valley forensic meetings. Tom Rousse was a very close and dear friend. We were guests in each others homes on numerous occasions, and for several years we did exploratory work and some writing in preparing a college speech text for beginners. Although our dream of doing the text went glimmering, our camaraderie didn't. I was also a close friend of Ed Miller, and knew Wayne Thompson well when he was my neighbor at the University of Missouri. And I have fond memories of Jesse Villarreal when he was a student debater and orator. I recall on a number of occasions how he shook the rafters of old Fraser Hall on the KU campus. So every morning as I walk across the mall by the Union building and look up towards the tower, I say to myself, "Yes, in many ways, this is a sentimental journey." Well, so much for the warm-up part of this talk.

As I glance across the historical horizon of our field of interest, I see the names of men made of pretty stern stuff. There is John Witherspoon, signer of the Declaration of Independence, Lecturer on Rhetoric at

Princeton, who had an outstanding pupil by the name of James Madison. I see the name John Quincy Adams, sixth president of the nation, who chaired the Department of Rhetoric at Harvard. There's Ralph Waldo Emerson, who was a kind of a speech professor without portfolio. Woodrow Wilson taught debate at Princeton; William McKinley was an ardent student of elocution; and William J. Bryan and Robert La Follette were college orators. And Arthur Goldberg, Justice of the Supreme Court, debated against my teams at Kansas in 1929. Ted Sorensen, close advisor to the late president Kennedy and his chief speech writer, was a star debater at the University of Nebraska in the late '40s. And I see the name of Lyndon B. Johnson who coached high school debaters in Texas. So colleagues, I say, chins up! We could be in worse company!

Our discipline has a long and distinguished heritage dating back to the older cultures of Egypt, Greece and Rome, covering a span of some 3,000 years. It survived the Middle Ages, nurtured at times by leaders of the Christian movement. It was somewhat modified and refined during the Renaissance, brightened up a bit by poetics and reinforced by theories of logic. Many students and scholars in our mother country diligently explored and further energized the contributions of the Greeks and Romans. But in reality all of this had little effect upon the quality of public speaking in the pulpit and in parliament. Rhetorical study was not enough.

This gave rise to the elocutionary movement which began about 1750. Frederick W. Haberman of Wisconsin sees this as an off-shoot of rhetorical study and was a response to the demands of the age. Haberman writes, "It was an exhaustive and systematic analysis of delivery (he is now speaking about elocution). The movement, however, was more than a simple renaissance of a particular canon of rhetoric. It was, rather, a new ordering of an old subject." The elocutionary movement had its roots in the concept that man, engaged in oral discourse, is controlled by natural laws, and

these laws could be systematized in a more or less scientific manner. Thus, the theorists embarked upon their mission of reducing speaking to a system, especially the delivery phase of speaking. The American colonists, while giving heed to the classical attitude towards rhetoric and rhetorical theory, soon became avid imitators, adaptors, and even plagiarists of the elocutionists in England. But their full force did not become manifest upon the American scene until four decades following the Civil War.

From colonial times to the turn of the 20th Century, the speech act, in the form of oratory, forensic disputation, debate, declamation, and acting, was commonly stressed in various ways within the colleges and the campus environment. These activities were frequently integrated with class day exercises, chapel functions, special events, commencements, inter- and intra- literary society programs, intramural affairs, and intercollegiate forensic competition. Faculty supervision and direction of these speaking ventures varied widely as to quantity and quality. Often, there was little or no supervision at all. Almost all of these activities were on a non-curricular and a non-credit basis. Curricular status, which required college credit, did not become a standard and permanent practice until the beginning of the twentieth century. The limited amount of work in speech performance of various types which did occur at the turn of the century was in the English departments. This brings up to date the historical moment when public speaking was to make its break away from the controls and policies of the teachers of English, and this marks the beginning of our profession and its claim to being an academic discipline.

Please note that in one sense the discipline of speech teaching can claim a longer existence than any other subject in the curriculum. While in another sense, speech education, structured within the framework of departmental programs and courses oriented academically, is a very recent phenomenon. It

is only 50 years old. Our discipline, on the basis of its rapid growth and expansion in the past half-century, ranks among the top five percent of all the subject areas of the college curriculum. The only one that had a more phenomenal expansion that I can think of is aeronautics. So, at this very moment, we stand on the verge of a glorious breakthrough of academic worthiness with great political and social-cultural overtones. Or, perhaps, we stand on the edge of a dangerous precipice, about to lunge forward into ignominious oblivion.

Now to the heart of the matter--a historical account of the past half-century of speech education in the United States. I speak not so much from the position of wide scholarly research, but rather I speak as an eyewitness. Yes, I was there, Charlie. I personally knew 14 of the 17 that signed the Declaration of Independence, which gave us freedom from the National Council of English Teachers. Three of them were my teachers, and I knew intimately more than 100 of the stalwarts who gave shape and impetus to our manifest destiny. I was also a student or a teacher of speech for 48 of these 50 years. Before we look at the facts, consider for a moment what our world was like when this association was born. World War I was in full blast; Henry Ford was just getting the nation on wheels; scarcely half of the homes had telephones, and radio was still to come; city travel was largely by streetcar, and there were only silent movies. No P.A. systems, no tape recorders--it was the heyday of Billy Sunday, as it was for the Chautauqua and the Lyceum. The spell of oratory of William Jennings Bryan was upon the land. But it is hard for us to realize that if Mr. Bryan spoke every day, seven times a week, for thirty years before packed houses of two thousand each, he still would have only a sprinkling of an audience compared to what President Johnson had on Inauguration Day. His audience was eight times as large as that of Mr. Bryan's lifetime total. In my view, his listeners were able to see and hear him. They all had a ringside seat.

What about speech teaching as a profession in 1914? There were no departments of speech, no speech majors, no Master's or Ph.D.'s offered, no speech texts to speak of, and no one taught only speech-related subjects. Every large city had its private school of elocution and oratory, and these had a somewhat unsavory connotation, filtered here and there into college catalogs. There was no body of research, no cross-fertilization of minds to provide our pioneers with an adequate basic philosophy to assure us of a home in an academic environment. James O'Neill, our association's first president, sensed this and preached the need for research at the very first convention. He deplored our lack of scholarship and said, "We're split up in all sorts of schools of belief." Such terms as empathy and circular response were unheard of. The term discussion was seldom found in debate books, and if you did find it, it had reference to the body of the brief. You mentioned the word feedback, and you thought of the Iowa farmer who feeds hogs. Communication reminded you of telephone wires. Such terms as multidirectional, semantic differential, listening theory, cybernetics, .005 level of confidence, and teaching machines were all unheard of, but the leaders had vision, faith and determination.

Our first president, James O'Neill, in his opening address at the first convention, proudly asserted, "so for the first time, we stand united!" He spoke about professional solidarity, and he warned us that we could advance only under a united front. He reminded the small convention group of a resolution that brought us into being. It was formed, he said, for the purpose of promoting research and more effective teaching. He talked about these twin attributes of opportunity and responsibility as they related to our field of academic endeavor. He pleaded that we set up standards for grading and rating students and teachers. And he pleaded that we clean our own house of malpractice. He warned us about overdoing performance on platform and stage, and told us that we must look to the classroom for our best

and most important work and for our most enduring rewards.

Thus, goals had emerged, and there was a sense of direction at the first convention. There were 65 members present. At our last convention there were over 3,000. Today, a dozen universities have as many as 65 on their speech faculty. The national membership totaled 165. Today, Northwestern has five times that many majors. Today, our association has a membership of about 8,000. Counting members in the theatre arts, speech and hearing, the radio broadcasters, the total exceeds 22,000. Nearly 20,000 advanced degrees in speech were granted in the past four decades. More than 200 schools offer a Master's degree, more than 50 doctoral degrees. About 6,000 speech majors are graduated annually. About 55% of the colleges now require at least one speech course for graduation.

At first, there were only three major areas of study--public speaking, oral interpretation, and theatre. Now there are a dozen or more, which include rhetoric, public speaking, interpretation, theatre, debate, discussion, radio, television, speech education, speech science, speech and hearing rehabilitation and speech in organizational communication. The catalogs of many large universities list more than 100 courses in speech and its related subject areas. Where there was one major speech journal, now there are three. Radio-television, theatre, and speech and hearing have national publications of their own. And four regional organizations have separate annual conventions and quarterly journals. Most of the states have separate conventions and journals at regular intervals. The field of forensics alone has four separate publications. Thus, as we look across the short span of 50 years, one towering fact stands out: our professional growth and development, both as to quantity and quality, has been phenomenal. Here is a mark of progress and accomplishment that cannot be matched elsewhere in the world. This is definitely an American phenomenon. But, glory

be, now we belong to the academic community. We're beginning to feel at home as we sit at the table and break bread with our colleagues from other fields of learning. So much for the facts.

Now for something more interesting and exciting. How come our profession had this remarkable growth and attained its present stature? The causes are indeed complex. But let's consider three major influences. First, we must consider the time and nature of our American culture. Voltaire once wrote about an idea whose time had come. Ours is a new nation, rich in the heritage of oratory and experience of free and open assembly and self-government. Freedom of speech and expression was part of the law of the land. We grew up in the climate of private enterprise and rugged individualism. Our laws, coupled with the spirit of the pioneer, encouraged people to shape their destiny with their tongues. The elocution movement, for four decades following the Civil War, provided the spawning places from which original and purposeful oral communication could emerge.

Secondly, our discipline was ushered closer to the college door by two assists: intercollegiate forensics and public speaking in business and industry. College debating swept the country almost two decades before our association was born. Three national honorary forensic organizations were established before we got going. Intercollegiate oratory flourished in varying degrees two decades earlier, and orators and debaters generally had the blessing of college deans and administrators. These activities appealed to students with a superior intellect and ability; they, at least, provided a favorable academic image. College debating flourished despite a constant barrage of criticism. Many claimed that debaters and coaches placed too much emphasis upon winning. This always seemed silly to me, for in my 40 years as debate coach and Director of Forensics, I never had the honor of being hanged in effigy. Out of some 800 schools engaging in debate, I have yet to hear about a

single case where a debate coach had this experience. It is interesting to note that more than half of those who held the office of President of this association, and 60% of the editors of the Quarterly Journal, and 85% of the chairmen of our leading speech departments were once involved in forensics as students or teachers. Educational forensics was a proving ground for the future leadership of the profession.

Public speaking courses were popular among adults in business and professions. The city YMCA's, out of which the Dale Carnegie courses grew, offered their services in a non-academic manner. And, incidentally, at the present moment more than one million students have graduated from the Dale Carnegie programs. Thus, fathers who were salesmen and executives began to urge their sons and daughters to take public speaking courses in college, and when these courses were not available, the administrators became sensitive to the need.

But, much more important than our cultural climate and the assists from forensics in the business world and its influence upon our field, we must recognize that scores of men and women of our ranks and our profession really had the greatest influence--the stalwarts of our field from 1930-55. These are the prime architects of our present academic house. And I shall call the names of a few: Andrew Weaver, constant academic statesman, author of many well-known books, chairman of the department at Wisconsin for over 30 years, able administrator and leader. A. Craig Baird, giant among us in forensics and rhetoric, gave us a breakthrough in speech criticism and vitally influenced the field of rhetoric through his counsel and direction of scores of doctoral studies. Alan A. Monroe wrote a beginning speech text that swept the field for a quarter of a century. H. Hayes Yeager, builder of Speech Departments at George Washington and Ohio State, made outstanding contributions to speech education in business and industry. Claude M. Wise, architect of one of the strongest and largest graduate-level

departments in the nation, was co-author of the classic book, The Bases of Speech. Bower Aly, strong contributor to speech rhetoric, gave his time and service for a quarter of a century to the improvement of debate materials for the high schools across the nation. And W. Norwood Brigance was the editor and director of perhaps the most significant complex of scholarly writings in our field, namely, The History of American Public Address. He was a dynamic spokesman for our cause and producer of several widely-used texts. James McBurney, Dean of one of the oldest and largest speech schools, left his stamp on the field of radio broadcasters, of discussion, debate and fundamentals of speech and is now Chairman of the Department at Northwestern University. Lionel Crocker, the general practitioner of our field, wrote books and articles galore on oral interpretation, public speaking, forensics, rhetoric, and adult education. Karl A. Wallace, editor of The History of Speech Education, a specialist in classical rhetoric, had significant influence in the upgrading of academic character of the beginning speech courses in college. Loren Reid, constant scholar and writer in the area of beginning speech and advanced rhetoric, gave us useful books for teachers of speech at both the high school and college level. Thomas A. Rousse, who laid the groundwork of a strong speech education program at Texas, widely influenced the field of forensics in the Southwest, both at the college and high school level. Kenneth G. Hance, director of scores of studies in the area of discussion, debate, and speech rhetoric, author of many books and journals, demonstrated remarkable skills as leader and chairman at association conferences. Ralph G. Nichols, sometimes called "Mr. Listener," whose vast studies and extensive writings concerning listening behavior greatly influenced our thinking on the communication act. Waldo W. Braden, from Louisiana State University, chairman of the department, produced many widely-used books and articles about public speaking and rhetoric and made deep impressions upon the college field of forensics in general. Robert Oliver, last president of the association, architect of an

outstanding speech department at Penn State, made unique contributions to communication related to international diplomacy and international thinking.

Well, thus far I've given names of only those who were president of the National Association, but this office is not the only criteria for mentioning them. We must mention other names. Edward L. Hunt has contributed scholarly articles, philosophical in nature, about education and the rhetoric in our journals over a period of five decades. Giles W. Gray has been one of the most prolific writers covering many subjects, but we owe most to him for the monumental work, The Speech Index. Hoyt H. Hudson produced some of the finest literary specimens on classical rhetoric ever produced in our quarterly journals. Elwood Murray, chief instigator of the progressive discussion technique, related speech to the personality and was a pioneer in launching concepts about theories of communication. He's often called the founder of the National Society for the Study of Communication. Franklin Knower brought new stature and meaning to Speech Monographs through his editorship; he was a careful researcher and an author of outstanding articles and books. G. E. Densmore built an outstanding department at the University of Michigan; served as the society's most durable and effective promoter and salesman during the decade of the '30s. Lew Sarett, University of Illinois and Northwestern University, author of many well-known speech texts and a poet, was a master teacher in the classroom. He had a rare gift to stimulate and inspire students toward their own self-realization. And I owe much of my strength as a speech teacher for 40 years to this one man; without him, I would not be here today. And my testimony is the echo of hundreds of others. Of course there are other names to include of more modern times: Jeffrey Auer, present president of the Association, able scholar and administrator; Wayne Thompson, stern in scholarship, a careful analyst of our present trends and the present editor of Speech Monographs; Marie Hochmuth Nichols, a giant in

rhetorical theory; and Madge Kramer, one-time president of the association and a superb teacher and outstanding authority in speech pedagogy.

These men and women were more than just scholars. They were dynamic, imaginative, human individuals. They were all "regular guys." Professionally speaking, we've all been our brother's keeper--leaning on each other for knowledge, insights and academic strength. The principle of lend-lease was always in full force. No one had a copyright on an idea. And, thus, the miracle of growth and maturation, accumlating like a snowball, was our richest blessing which could be shared by all. When I return to Texas University in the year 2015, I will say to them in Churchill's style, "Never in a hundred years have we owed so much to so few."

Our field is broad and complex. Categories of our academic discipline emerged from different dimensions. Clarence Simon, in 1928 in the Quarterly Journal, writes about the market for our products. He makes an arrangement of four categories: 1) teachers, 2) performers, 3) technicians, and 4) research men. Jeffrey Auer, in his Introduction to Graduate Study, makes a classification of fundamentals of speech, public address, interpretation, radio-television, theatre, speech and hearing disorders and speech education.

In our graduate seminar #384, History and Trends in Speech Education, we direct our thinking at another classification, and this I must confess is my own. First are the functional and service courses--these are the utilitarian type and represent the great bulk of the undergraduate bread and butter courses. These courses serve speech departments much as speech composition serves the English departments. I sometimes call them the skin and skull practice courses. They represent guided direction in being orally articulate. Second, I would call the theory courses. These courses study and explore the underlying laws

and principles that make the wheels go around in various processes of oral communication. They are represented by rhetorical and oratorical theory, theories of listening, theories of communication, theories of learning, of discussion, of debate, of persuasion, of language, of education, and of research. The third area relates to courses which characterize professional aptitudes. These include speech pedagogy, special courses in education, clinical practice, courses in speech corrrection, technical courses in radio and television, specialty courses in theatre arts, such as stage designing, costuming, lighting, play directing, play writing, and some of the courses in the behavioral sciences. The fourth area includes those courses which develop academic and cultural outlooks, such as courses in British and American drama, theatre in Western Civilization, theatre in Oriental culture, history of Greek, Roman, British and American public address, and survey courses in communication arts. And the fifth area includes those courses involving directed studies, seminars, research of various types--descriptive, historical and experimental--all at the graduate level.

There are a few reflections and observations worthy of our attention that I now want to take up. The first concerns the name of our organization. The organization in 1914, at its birth, was called the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking. In 1917, the name was changed to the National Association of Teachers of Speech. In 1946, the name Speech Association of America was adopted.

The second observation I want to make concerns the shifting attitude towards our discipline. We started out in a revolutionary spirit. We were "cause conscious." The going wasn't easy, and Andrew Weaver described the atmosphere in which speech teachers lived: "Most of us worked in an environment of suspicion, hostility and contempt." And when the organization was founded, Winans said, "the

real urge in the beginning was just to get together to get bucked up." During the first three decades we were bent upon self-defense and self-promotion at the same time. We were propagandists of a sort, and we shouted our wares from the housetops, but during World War II all of this was changed. The Conant Committee, known as the Harvard Report dealing with courses and objectives for trainees in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, more than any other single thing, sparked a turn around. Result: the higher echelon of the university and the outside world began knocking at our door. There were demands for upgrading and improving the communication skills in speaking and writing. Since writing skills were long a standard fixture, speaking skills benefited by this new emphasis and expansion. And during the past two decades we did little towards self-promotion. We had our hands full taking care of the demands.

Thirdly, the concept of unity through diversity became a guiding philosophy. Despite the explosive growth and the broadening base of our field, cohesive elements generally held the profession together. Radio, which initially was claimed by physics and engineering, then by journalism, gravitated toward speech departments, where in a large measure it found a home. A similar pattern applies to television. Discussion had its original impulse in the area of social science, education and business administration. But speech people clarified the discipline through their writings and course work applications, and now the academic meaning of discussion is well-lodged within our area, even though it is widely practiced in the curricular programs of social sciences and the business schools.

Speech correction and audiology among European countries is largely confined to the school of medicine. This large and important area flowered and matured for the most part in America under the canopy of speech departments, even though the discipline has created a

national order of its own with separate conventions and publications.

Drama courses are occasionally found with English departments, and theatre arts courses may be part of the Fine Arts college in some instances. The theatre arts courses in some cases are completely separate and stand alone. But, in most instances, they are under the control and administration of speech departments.

The fourth observation concerns the communication movement. One significant development in the past fifteen years which may profoundly affect our manifest destiny is a fringe or overlapping discipline which influences the area of speech, journalism, English, anthropology and radio-television--this is called communication. Since I will dwell at length with this subject in my next lecture, I'll only touch upon it today.

What the total impact of this movement may have upon the hierarchy of our field, the men in rhetoric and rhetorical theory, is a matter of conjecture and speculation. I still look upon rhetoric and public address as the mainstay of our profession. Here has been our great strength in terms of scholarship. Here is where the architects of our edifice have done their finest work and created our best image. And we're not about to surrender the gains of Winans and Weaver, O'Neill, Brigance, McBurney, Hance, Wallace, Hochmuth, Oliver and scores of others. And I'm not one to fully subscribe to the theory reflected by Charles Redding when he proclaimed, "The rhetoricians are happy with their dead orators; the deader the better."

Yet, I faintly see a kind of handwriting on the wall. I view the future with some concerns for the rhetoricians. Public address of the oratorical or the classical type, seems to be rapidly degenerating and declining on the college campus and in public life. The models of the creative piece in the last two political campaigns give us little to shout about. The type of speakers exemplified by Winston

Churchill, Jack Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson and Franklin Roosevelt seem to be vanishing from public view. The products found in vital speeches of today are a far cry from those of two or three decades ago. Will the model specimens of the public platform give us in the future a body of speech literature worthy of our serious rhetorical study? Ah, there's the rub; what new rich veins will there be in the coming quarter of a century in which our rhetoricians may dig and explore and reap the rewards to which they are accustomed? I do not mean to imply that the men of rhetoric will be crowded out of the saddle. That is not the point. What matters is how will they adjust and adapt themselves to the developing trends and the multiple approaches to the speech communication process.

The fifth observation concerns graduate studies. One of the healthier and most reassuring features of the entire speech education movement lies in our growing strength at the gradute level. Since much of speech communication is inherently oriented to the creative arts, much of our subject matter does not lend itself as readily to research as does the science areas. Yet the opportunities and needs for various types of studies and searches, both of the creative and experimental nature, lie before us. New and challenging frontiers for investigation and study are emerging. And more graduate and post-graduate studies are the wave of the future. Our graduate programs owe much of their success to an arrangement by which candidates for advanced degrees can teach and study at the same time. In some schools with sophisticated graduate programs, as much as 70-90% of the teaching load of the beginning speech courses is handled by graduate assistants. The college enrollment explosion aggravates this trend. When so much of the teaching is done by young, inexperienced interns, the quality of instruction may suffer, but this is counterbalanced by the reward of teacher training and the general enrichment of the graduate program. And I am inclined to believe that in total, and in the long run, the

profession will gain more than it loses by this arrangement.

And as I close this lecture a few observations in perspective may be in order. Styles and methods of teaching have changed in response to revolutionary developments germane to our culture. Mass communication studies, sparked by radio and television, have made a great impact upon us. Rapid and drastic developments in psychology and medicine give rise to adjustments in clinical approaches in speech pathology. Studies in communication theory with revolutionary concepts relating to the speech communication act are now profoundly influencing our attitudes toward the speaking performance as such. Delivery has almost become a dirty word in some places. Machine-teaching and TV lectures, born out of the pressures of increased enrollments, accentuate the need for further adaptation and approaches to speech learning. The growing awareness of the need for speech as a functional tool for better living in our free society brings new and awesome opportunities and responsibilities, especially upon the beginning speech course which is the only one most college students will ever take. This course alone, in many colleges, involves twice as many students as all of the other courses combined in the entire department. More and more, it is becoming a world apart from the hard core of our profession in terms of our attitudes and thinking. And here we stand in real danger of committing our greatest sins of omission. Here is where we can best create a favorable image before the academic hierarchy of the college; and here is our best place to maneuver our discipline in line with the standards and goals of our liberal education.

Our profession can and should be made to endure. Few subject areas can be adapted so readily as ours to the development of the whole man. Speech can serve to broaden the horizon of information, toughen the mental fiber, make the heart more sensitive to what is beautiful, and enable man to communicate more effectively with his environment. Yes, speech, God's most

wonderful gift to man, is the gift of power. And shall this power be for good or evil in a world fraught with danger? We do have an important role in human destiny.

# REFLECTIONS ABOUT A PROFESSION EXTRAORDINARY

(A Speech Presented to the Speech Communication Association National Convention, December 27, 1974, at Chicago, Illinois. Other panel members were Bower Aly, Frances McCurdy, and Marie Nichols.)

Having recently become an octogenarian, I feel deeply honored to be a member of this panel.

There are so many facets to our profession that I could not settle on a particular point of view. So I decided to mix my perspectives into three parts: Part I. "I was there, Charlie"; Part II. "Something funny happened along the way"; Part III. "So What?"

Yes, I was there, Charlie. When this association was born, I was a grown man. Two years after the association came into being, I was deeply involved in two activities which helped it to come into being--elocution and forensics. These two activities were not very compatible. Elocution sneaked in the back door; forensics came in the front door in broad daylight without an escort. For four years I took elocution lessons, two years at the college level, two years as a graduate.

But what really turned me on was oratory. I spent months preparing my oration. I revised this masterpiece 13 times and privately had it published before the contest.

After graduation I made a beeline for the famous Cumnoch School of Oratory and received my "B.O." Degree--"Bachelor of Oratory," that is. There were 61 graduates; 60 were women. Two years later, 1923, I received the first M.A. degree in speech ever offered by Northwestern.

I knew 15 of the 17 men who signed the historic Declaration of Independence to break

away from the National Council of English teachers to form "The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking." Five of these men were my teachers.

In the beginning, among academic people, we suffered a credibility gap. We were looked upon as a kind of scrawny group, groping and squirming in a climate of doubt, suspicion, and even contempt. There were almost no speech departments, no speech majors, no graduate programs for advanced degrees, no speech texts to speak of, no body of research, no cross-fertilization of minds to provide our profession with a basic philosophy to lend prestige in an academic environment.

But a miracle was in the making. The most wonderful and mysterious happening of our profession was its phenomenal growth, expansion and vitality. It didn't just grow up like Topsy. It was conceived, nurtured, and structured by men and women of purpose, faith, vision, and boundless energy. The mission impossible was accomplished.

Yes, I was there, Charlie. I was involved for 53 years as a student or teacher. I taught in seven different universities, three since retirement, over a span of 46 years and was Director of Forensics 42 years. I organized and taught 112 speech classes for business and industry, served as technical advisor in the production of 16 speech films, heard more than a quarter of a million speeches without being bored.

Boy, did things ever happen along the way. Elocution almost totally vanished within a decade. Graduate programs began to appear in large numbers, offering M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. Today there are 900 speech departments; 200 schools offer an M.A. degree, and 63 offer Ph.D.s. Attendance at our national convention jumped from 60 to 3,000, membership from 160 to over 20,000. Regional and national journals jumped from two or three to 60, not to mention state journals. Schools which once offered a dozen courses now offer a hundred or more. In

my time Kansas University's Speech and Drama staff jumped from two to 50 members.

Intercollegiate forensics took hold in a big way. Three forensic honor societies were founded during the decade before our association was born. During the first ten years of our Quarterly Journal, more was written about forensics than any other subject. During the first 50 years, half of the presidents of our association and three-fourths of our department chairmen came from the ranks of forensics.

But the really big thing that happened was the coming of that 13-letter word "Communication." No one can define it, but it stirred up quite a fuss in every nook and corner of our profession. It is not a new word, yet I could not find it in the index of many speech texts before the mid '30s.

The word didn't strike suddenly like an earthquake or a volcano. It didn't come quietly like Carl Sandburg's fog "On Little Cat Feet." It came more like a trillion little "Burning Bushes," vibrating the senses, minds and souls of people. It came from all directions, during all seasons, at all places, on street corners, sales counters, family kitchens, the pulpit, the moon, in speech journals and books. Some called it a movement, some called it an overlaid function of life and living, some called it an academic discipline. Some said you can't live without it, like oxygen. We like to think that ours is a verbal-oriented society. Yet we deal twice as much with the non-verbal than the verbal.

Even some three-letter words are difficult to define, such as sin, sex, and gas. Sin is old stuff. Sex is both old and new and still remains a fathomless mystery. There are times when sin and sex mean the same thing. But gas is new. We learned all about it in 12 months.

How come this sudden, dramatic renaissance oriented to communication? Much of this was sparked by an event that happened during World War II. Early in the war, a national Research

Defense Committee was formed by executive order with James Conant, President of Harvard, as Chairman. The purpose of this committee was to set up guidelines for the training of two million servicemen doing special course work in nearly 300 colleges and universities. One of the seven courses required was called "Communication" to improve the performance skills for both writing and speaking.

This dual emphasis upon communication had more of an impact upon speech teachers than teachers of English. Speech as an education discipline was relatively new, compared to English. Following the war, college presidents and deans began to knock on our doors with proposals to make a basic speech course a requirement for graduation.

There were many striking side effects. The word communication began to overshadow the term speech. It became prominent in our textbooks, in our journals, in courses offered, even in the name of departments and our national association. For some, the academic image of speech education was being contaminated; others felt it generated a broader base for our profession and injected realism into what we were doing. Some of the ardent advocates of communication perhaps over-reacted. I recall Charles Redding once remarked in his best rhetorical style, "You men of rhetoric are happy with your dead orators, the deader the better." It was something like the coming of the New Testament. "Glory Be," they shouted. "We have the New Testament, now let's burn the Old."

Lest we forget--there could be no communication movement without the heritage of rhetoric. You cannot burn the products of the oratory; of Cicero, of Webster, Lincoln, Churchill, or the Sermon on the Mount.

The high priests of rhetoric were the lords and masters of our house of speech education. When the standard bearers of communication knocked on the door, the high priests kicked them out. But these unwelcome callers went around the house through the back doors and

side doors and came to stay, and the high priests were powerless. In this, our house, are many mansions or rooms prepared for many different missions. All are under the same roof. There is no place in this house for "either/or" signs or slogans. Communication needs rhetoric, and rhetoric needs communication. You cannot destroy one without destroying the other.

So what? Our profession has always been in a state of flux. We have always wrestled with "unity midst diversity." We have held together pretty well by one common bond - our concern for people, the two-legged, walking masterpieces of the creative process. As James Armstrong, Dean of Northwestern, put it, "You speech teachers deal with human stuff." Furthermore, we speech teachers enjoy a unique environment drawing strength from each other, for reaping the blessings of being our brother's keeper.

Pardon me for a bit of personal testimony. I am not a self-made man. Far from it. What I am or became, in a personal or professional sense, I owe to others. I would not be here on this program were it not for Lew Sarett. I owe so much to him--he opened a window for me. When I was lost, he helped me find myself and have many ventures in self-renewal.

Will Rogers was a big help to me in a strange way. After breaking two lecture engagements which I sponsored, he gave the University of Kansas a check for a thousand dollars, three times our annual forensic budget. This money was used for two big debate tours among schools of the Big Ten and the Ivy League. This put KU on the map in forensics and sponsored strong support for forensics which lasted 40 years.

Bower Aly, some 40 years ago, cleared the way for me to be the designated author and compiler of 16 debate handbooks.

Hugo Hellman called me by phone some 30 years ago, which resulted in my becoming

President of Delta Sigma Rho for 11 years and shaped a segment of my professional life for a quarter of a century.

Were it not for Tom Rousse, Bower Aly, and Leroy Laase, I would never have been a visiting professor after retirement at the Universities of Texas, Hawaii and Nebraska. Thanks to others, I know the meaning of the words "my professional cup runneth over."

I confess a concern about the quality of classroom teaching today, especially the basic speech communication courses. Here the teacher faces a unique opportunity for developing the inner man and his many-sided personality. The way some of these classes are handled today, I suspect that Abraham Lincoln, a Will Rogers, or Jesus Christ would flunk the course.

We dare not lose sight of the importance of teaching the person. This point came home to me midway in my professional career. Dr. U. G. Mitchell, Chairman of the Math Department at KU, was a perennial candidate for the most outstanding teacher award. When his colleagues begged him to tell them his secret for outstanding success, he replied: "Heaven's sake, I don't teach mathematics. No one can teach math--I just teach people." We can't teach effective speaking. As we teach the person--the total self--the skills of speech communication processes will find their natural orbit. Teach the person, and he will teach himself. Oh, Quintillian, where art thou?

My closing note is about a dream. I have a dream that someday this profession will have a code of ethics, a credo, or some rules of conduct concerning standards for responsible communication which relate to what is true, honest, honorable, just and good for humanity. The medical profession is guided by the Hippocratic Oath; lawyers are guided by the Canons of Ethics, judges by rules of conduct, certified accountants by strict laws for auditing accounts.

Can't we do something about vulgarity, obscenity, plagiarism, character assassination, lying and all sorts of verbal violence? Must we as a profession always stand by in silence, twiddling our thumbs, when such things as McCarthyism, Watergates, and destruction of careers take place? Even the Bible reminds us that calling your brother a fool deserves severe punishment. Call me again a few years hence when I grow up a little more.

A PROFESSION EXTRAORDINARY--MADE IN U. S. A.

(This tape was prepared for high school libraries during the fall of 1975, as requested by the Lawrence Kiwanis Club.)

I am E. Christian Buehler, Professor Emeritus, Department of Speech Communication, University of Kansas. This tape is about speech education in the U. S. A. I have been a classroom speech teacher in seven different colleges and universities over the past 50 years. Since the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking was founded only a few years before I became a college speech teacher, I will base my story upon personal experience as well as research.

In the broad sense, speech education has a long and distinguished history dating back among the oldest cultures. We first hear about it among the Egyptians way back in 2500 B.C. But the monumental impact as it concerns us came from the Greeks and Romans during the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. These ancient people turned themselves on in a big way for the study and practice of the science and art of communication by means of the spoken word. Speech was considered highly important for the operation of a free society. Oral discourse was heavily stressed at all levels of education--primary, secondary, and advanced. It is difficult to imagine what speech as an educational discipline would be like in America were it not for these ancient Greeks and Romans. We owe so much to them. Speech instruction was continued in a limited way during the Middle Ages, but was controlled largely by the intellectual few and was strongly influenced by the Church.

Speech as a performing art became more important in Europe during the Renaissance period, and the greatest interest developed in our mother country. And for 300 years speech education, as we call it, thrived in England

when she turned out some of the most eloquent speakers the world has ever known.

The root concepts about oral discourse came over to our shores with the Mayflower. During the Colonial period, the established colleges recognized the importance of oral discourse and gave emphasis to it in various ways. Rhetoric was part of the curriculum at Harvard University as early as 1636. Training consisted largely in the form of oral presentation of memorized speeches, not in English, but in Greek and Latin--mostly Latin. Eventually, students got tired of doing things in a classical language and turned to declamations and original speeches. Literary societies and debating clubs were formed, and advanced students gave declamations and speeches at chapel exercises, class day functions, literary programs and commencement occasions. Various members of the faculty were enlisted to give counsel and act as coaches for these performances. While some of this was integrated with regular class work, the larger portion of effort was of a noncurricular nature.

In general, we might say that from colonial days to the turn of the century speech education was limited, spotty, sporadic and marked by shifting trends. Efforts were widely diversified. There was no central, unified professional approach of national proportion. There were two prevailing major outlooks or attitudes. One concerned rhetoric or public speaking and the other had to do with elocution. In a sense, these two approaches to oral discourse were not very compatible. Yet, each played a key role which led to the birth and the establishment of what has come to be known as the profession of speech educators.

Rhetoric was composed of the more solid stuff. It was concerned about what the man said, the trustworthiness of his contentions, the shape and arrangement of his ideas, his use of language, his use of emotional and logical proof, and the credibility of the speaker himself. On every hand, the rhetorical processes in varying degrees met the demands of

an academic discipline. It offered a way for productive scholarship. Yet, in spite of these virtues, rhetoric seemed to have little effect upon the quality of the speaking performance among the preachers, lawyers, and politicians. This gave rise to the elocution movement which began in England and was promptly transported to our shores during colonial times.

Elocution was mainly concerned with delivery. The elocutionist had the notion that delivery was governed by natural laws and could be systematized in a more or less scientific manner. From the Civil War to World War I, the elocutionary movement experienced its greatest growth and expansion. More than 100 authors wrote books on the subject. Private schools of expression or elocution sprang up all over the country. Elocution lessons and courses were offered in many colleges, especially the privately endowed church schools. This was a time of cultural awakening for young America, marked by a yearning for entertainment among the grass roots. The elocution movement was especially appealing to the feminine youth. The image of culture and refinement for a girl was to be able to play the piano or speak a piece. Hence, the great majority of elocution students were women, and women teachers were also in predominance.

Obviously this was not an undercover movement for prominent actors; orators and preachers took elocution lessons. President McKinley was an ardent student of elocution, and Professor Frank Strong, late Chancellor of the University of Kansas, was at one time an elocution instructor.

Shortly after the turn of the century, the elocution movement fell into disrepute. This was a widespread negative reaction. Public performers trained by hardcore elocutionists seemed unnatural and artificial. Their performances did not have the true ring. The image of elocution soured, especially at the level of the college academic hierarchy. One dean used the term "bellowcution" for elocution to reflect his contempt.

However, the hard challenge to convey thought and feeling by voice and action for the actor remained. The notion that literature can best be understood and appreciated through oral reading remained. And educators, more than ever, became sensitive to the need for study and mastery of the rhetorical process. Thus, the role of elocution declined sharply after the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speakers was founded. However, I wish to point out that the movement, on balance in a backhanded way, did much to bring speech education to the college campus.

The movement to give speech curricular status had its origin and growth at the college level. But the movement spread rapidly among the high schools and lower grades. Today, probably more than half of all high school graduates have had one or more speech courses.

There was one type of noncurricular speech activity in the form of competitive forensics among both high schools and colleges which did much to help pave the way for the recognition of speech as an academic discipline. Experience and training in forensics appealed especially to the bright, industrious and ambitious student. College debating was well-established two decades before the national association of speech teachers was born and college oratory preceded this by nearly two decades.

Long before the advent of the debate tournaments and even before the popular rise of basketball and football, the forensic contest stood out as a highlight event on the college campus. These events were popular among students, faculty and the public. Railroads often provided special trains to transport people to and from these events. Victories were often celebrated by bands, bonfires, and parades. Star orators and debaters enjoyed hero worship, rivaling any star athletic performer of our time. In a similar way, though in a less spectacular degree, high schools in their local communities experienced widespread enthusiasm

and support for their forensic events be they intramural or interscholastic.

Now we come to the heart of the matter, namely a historical account of the birth and growth of speech education over little more than the past half century. The year 1914 marks the historic event when our profession was born. This all happened when a group of 17 men from the National Council of English Teachers voted to form a separate "National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking." These men of vision, courage, and determination did not see how elocution could ever lay claim to academic muscle and fiber. They also believed the manifest destiny of the spoken word could not be fulfilled in the confines of English departments. They believed that the use of the spoken word called for insights, skills, and disciplines very different from what was required by the written word. They insisted upon academic worthiness and they insisted that the new association should be national, not regional, in scope.

From this simple beginning, the Association took roots, and its growth and expansion has been miraculous. At the first convention in 1915, the total attendance numbered 60 and the total membership 160. Today the Association, counting Theatre Arts, Speech and Hearing, Communication Studies and Radio and T.V., has a total membership of 25,000, and 3,000 members frequently attend a national convention. More than half the colleges now require at least one speech course for graduation. There are more than 900 college speech departments, about 6,000 graduating speech majors; more than 200 schools offer a Master's degree and 50 or more a Doctor's degree. We witnessed more growth and progress in Speech Education in the country over the past half century than the world experienced during the preceding 25 centuries.

All this growth was experienced midst great difficulty. There was in the beginning, among college faculties, an atmosphere of doubt, suspicion, and even contempt for what the new leaders were trying to do. It was an uphill

fight from the start, and until World War II speech educators were on the defensive.

For the first decade or two our academic worthiness was seriously questioned. There were no speech departments, no speech majors, no graduate programs to offer a Master's or Doctor's degree. There were no speech texts to speak of; no one taught only speech-related subjects. There was no body of research, no cross-fertilization of minds to provide our profession with an adequate basic philosophy to lend prestige in an academic environment. Futhermore, it was difficult to overcome the image of over-doing performance on platform and stage.

But why did speech education fare so well? No nation in the world can match this professional achievement which occurred in America. First of all, the time and cultural climate were favorable for this phenomenal happening. We were imbued with the spirit of freedom and rugged individualism. The law of the land--the Constitution and the Bill of Rights--gave the green light for our people to shape their destiny with their tongues. This could not happen in a closed society. We must also give much credit to hundreds of stalwart men and women of our profession who demonstrated dynamic and constructive leadership in their academic and scholarly pursuits. They built the speech departments, inaugurated graduate programs and devised research projects. They wrote the textbooks, edited our journals and generously integrated their resources with their colleagues in other departments of the college. Furthermore, they shared freely their professional insights with the outside world of business and industry. The majesty of our professional edifice is almost wholly the handiwork of our fellow workers.

But way down deep, we must take a close look at the basic rationale which motivated and nourished the growth of speech education. How did this achievement of uncommon magnitude come about?

1. First of all is the fact that speech is a trump card as a means of communication. Man has a jump over all animals. He has the intelligence and the gift of speech. He has the best equipment to survive and adjust to his environment. He uses speech in 90% of all his decision-making ventures. He uses speech to make friends, to make love and to educate himself. He uses it to pray, govern himself and carry out all manner of pursuits of happiness.

2. Speech is a bulwark against loneliness. Solitary confinement is a rough and cruel kind of punishment. Man is a social animal, and speech feeds his social hunger.

3. Speech is a means for thinking. Speech and mental processes are bound together. A child's mind develops best when he can speak well. Even talking to yourself helps to stretch and energize the mind.

4. Speech forms the image of the man. People come to know us and measure us by what we say and how we talk. It is a mirror of what we are.

5. Speech helps you to find yourself. It is the key to self-renewal and self-discovery. It helps your personality to flower and unfold.

6. Speech is the best way to energize ideas, to explore problems, to stir up a brainstorm for wise solutions and for learning about things.

All told, we humans can live better and carry out pursuits of happiness more successfully if we can become more articulate. If the chief devil were to destroy man on earth, he would succeed best, not by use of hydrogen bombs, but by destroying all use of language and speech. Destroy speech and you destroy civilization.

There are numerous categories of our academic discipline which serve a wide variety

of purposes. Some courses are of the functional type and are commonly called service courses. They stress experience in the application of skills in speaking. Here we learn by doing. Some courses aim to examine and explore the underlying theories and principles that make the wheels go around in the various processes of oral communication. Some courses characterize professional aptitudes. They aim to help the student prepare for a specific profession or job, such as teaching, doing clinical work in speech therapy, technical work for radio and T.V., or specialty work in the area of theatre arts. Other courses aim to develop academic or cultural background. These are commonly survey or historical courses in theatre, drama, rhetoric, speech science, and communication theory. Still other courses at the graduate level may include directed study seminars and special types of research.

As I close my story, some observations may be in order. The whole field of Speech Communication is still very much in a state of flux. Styles and methods of teaching are changing with the revolutionary developments relevant to our culture. The movement involving the studies and theories of communication which started about a generation ago has had a profound influence upon the speech teaching profession. This has caused a reshuffling of attitudes relative to speaking performances of all kinds. The rhetoric-minded people are challenged to make adjustments relative to the communication impact wrought by the spoken word. We see the influence of the communication movement in our speech texts, the courses offered, and patterns and styles of research. Speech departments are becoming Departments of Speech Communication. Even the National Speech Association of America has changed its name to "Speech Communication Association."

There have been drastic developments in psychology and medicine calling for adjustments in clinical approaches in speech pathology. Machine teaching, lectures by T.V., and the use of video tape accent further adaptation in our approach to speech learning. There are signs

of innovation concerning problems of stage fright, listening behavior, the organization of speeches, interpersonal communication, patterns of speech criticism, and many other innovations are just around the corner.

Our profession shows promise that it will be here for a long time. Few subject areas can be so readily adapted to the development of the whole man. Speech can broaden the horizon of knowledge, toughen the mental fiber, make the heart more sensitive to what is beautiful, and enable man to communicate more effectively with his environment. Speech, God's most wonderful gift to man, is the gift of power. How should this power be used? Speech teachers and students have an important role in providing the answer.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE THROUGH THE PAST

(An address at the Conference of Directors of the Basic Speech Course of Mid-Western Universities, February 1978.)

(Professor Buehler was asked to address the banquet of the Conference, in part, because he was the founder of the Conference in 1962. The final words by Jon Blubaugh, Chairman and Toastmaster, introducing the speaker at the final conference banquet session were:

"WILL THE REAL FATHER OF THIS BABY PLEASE RISE AND BE RECOGNIZED?"

Glory Be! This is a great sentimental moment of my professional life. I confess before the courts of Heaven and Earth that I am the legitimate father of this baby, born 16 years ago. There's not another baby in the world like it. But there is something unique about this baby. I still don't know whether it's a boy or a girl. There is no mother.

Rule A in speech-making is: "Know your audience." So let's get acquainted by a show of hands. How many are attending your first conference of this kind? How many have had experience in high schools? How many of you have participated as forensic coach or participant? How many of you have your Ph.D. degree? How many of you are married? Still live with your spouse? How many of you take Geritol? Aw, skip it! Thanks, this makes me feel very much at home.

A word of caution about two factors that may cause static in today's communication ventures. First, this is a world of change. Lowell Thomas writes: "Father was born when U. S. Grant was President, when the telephone, the automobile, and even unstable electricity were

unknown, and died the last year of Harry Truman's presidency. It was an outstanding span in the history of mankind--from the pioneer to the nuclear era, a period during which more intellectual and scientific advance took place than in all the rest of recorded time. This means we're living in a whirl of new discoveries, new knowledge explosions, creating new horizons of ignorance for the individual, thus reducing the common areas of mutual interest. It has been said that Einstein, with his theory of relativity, had only six colleagues who knew what he was talking about. While the world of knowledge has tripled for me since I left college, my world of ignorance has more than quadrupled. The common denominators of knowledge have been shrinking.

The second drag in communication lies in the fact that it is difficult to listen to what an octogenarian has to say. I know this--I've been there; you haven't. But you can overcome these two barriers if you can say these words and mean it: "History is a bucket of ashes, is the bunk." If you can do that, then forget Shakespeare, the Bible, the Constitution, the Statue of Liberty, the space age. Forget the automobile, the telephone, electric lights, and, above all, the family tree. There is nothing left but a rotten, burned-out stump. Forget the use of words, spoken and written. Forget the gift of speech man devised eons ago. Forget this conference and all I have to say. Now I've done my lecturing and preaching, so let's get down to business.

I have been a college speech teacher for 46 years, serving seven different universities (three since retirement from K. U.); the Universities of Texas, Hawaii, and Nebraska. Three years of teaching resulted from my applications for a job; 43 years were by invitation.

I grew up on a farm in southeast Nebraska, midst pigs and corn. I was the youngest of four boys and the only one to go to high school. I started college during the great war and became a soldier in my junior year. I served overseas for a year and two months. I was fortunate to receive a big, rare fringe

benefit. I was one out of a thousand doughboys to receive a military grant to attend Kings College, University of London, spring and summer, 1919. Living in London marked a turning point of my life. Visions of becoming a farmer or preacher vanished from my mind. I received an honorable discharge from the Army in time to start my senior year in college, graduating June 1920.

Following graduation, I made a "beeline" for the Cumnoch School of Oratory, Northwestern University to get my B.O. degree (that is, Bachelor of Oratory) and to get my first teaching job and continue graduate studies for my M.A. degree (received June 1923). This was the first M.A. degree in Speech offered by Northwestern University. At that time I could count the number of M. A. degrees in Speech on the fingers of my hands.

I was not aware that a new national organization of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking was in the making. A whopper of a miracle was taking place. This association started from nothing. There was no body of research, no textbooks, no speech majors, no professional journals, no graduate programs for M.A. or Ph.D. Trained, qualified teachers were still to come. But it happened!

This profession extraordinary grew in size, strength, and academic credibility. In less than a decade, it established a place in the circle of the college academic hierarchy. Yes, I was there, Charlie.

This all happened because 17 men started a revolution by signing a declaration of independence from the National Council of English Teachers to establish the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking. I knew 14 of the 17 men; four were my teachers.

How come I landed in this profession I scarcely knew existed? Frankly, I stumbled into it by accident. Three episodes helped me to see the light. (1) The Chautauqua rang a bell for me to go to college and broaden my cultural horizon. (2) One college oration gave me the image of something noble in oral

communication. (3) Four years of elocution showed me things to turn on and off in speech delivery.

But I really never found myself and became totally committed to my professional mission until I was nearly 30 years old. But once I saw the light and made up my mind, I never had a moment of doubt or regret the rest of my life. My cup of happiness was always running over.

Jon, how am I doing?

A four-point rationale about speech as an academic discipline became firmly rooted in my mind. This had special meaning for the basic course.

Point One: Speech is a highly functional part of life and living. Man is forever in touch with the world with his tongue. Speech is a way to get things done, be it to raise a family, grow peanuts, play games, sell books, get votes, make love, pray to God. People who have something to say and can say it well show the most promise for success. Bill Easton, internationally-known coach of track and field events, told me a few days ago that he required his athletes to take two speech communication courses. Being able to express yourself helps the athlete to concentrate, have confidence, and have more physical energy.

Point Two: Speech is a bulwark against loneliness. Man is a social creature. You need someone to be somebody. One person alone is no person.

Point Three: Speech contains a magic formula for finding yourself and having endless ventures in self-renewal. It forms and nurtures the growth and flowering of one's total personality. It provides personal and individual sovereignty.

Point Four: Speech provides the invisible means for creative and critical thinking. It gives the mind a handle for inventing and energizing ideas and feelings. You can't think

without language. This asset can linger and grow throughout life.

I had three hard-core professional love affairs: forensics, business and professional speech, and the basic speech course.

Forensics brought me to K. U. My Washburn debaters came through with flying colors. The girls won the state championship, and the boys beat the K. U. Law School. So I was invited to come to K. U. I will never forget my first interview with Chancellor Lindley. He leaned over the desk and said, "Buehler, I want you to put K. U. on the map in forensics." We were at the bottom of the ladder in football, but that didn't matter. I guess if I was good enough to beat K. U., I was good enough to teach debate at K.U .

Forensics was a good image-maker for me. I was invited to membership in three honor forensic societies, which were formulated before our national speech association was born, and I served as President of Delta Sigma Rho for 11 years. Incidentally, nine of our speech faculty were coaches or participants in forensics.

Speech-making among business and professional people was almost another world by itself. I taught 112 courses of nine or more sessions each in ten states and 100 more shorter sessions for K. U. Extension Division. The age of my students ranged from 15 to 83, and the academic level ranged from coon hunter to Ph.D. I feel I got the best results for time and effort in this area of all my teaching experience--no books, no exams, no grades, no lectures.

Fundamentals of Speech. The basic course was my great concern the latter half of my teaching career. I was involved in writing five speech texts and technical advisor in the production of 17 educational films.

While Moses never got his show on the road until he was 80, I was past 65 when I dreamed up this Midwest Conference. For many years, I felt that within our profession of speech

teachers the greatest sins of omission were committed in the area of the basic course. Here we have too many of our poorest teachers and too few of our best. Upper-level teachers tend to look down on teaching this course as an unpleasant chore. Students object to the course because it is required. This is a threat to their self-image and self-confidence. For most students, this is their first and last speech course. In many instances, twice as many students enroll in this course than all the courses combined in the department.

For the last half of my time in service, I felt the regional and national speech conventions offered little to help the basic course teachers. I wanted a small, peer group to have brainstorming meetings without formal academic papers and freedom to pool their ideas and mutually help each other to be better teachers of the beginning course.

Finally, in June 1961, I caught a vision, triggered partly by a new organization called Mid-America State Universities Association. This was formed to improve quality of education at lower cost. This relates to six states with the Big Eight schools plus Colorado State and the University of Iowa. But I had two hurdles to overcome. I had to get the green light from the executive council of the six-state organization and the University of Kansas. After I got the "go" sign from both, I wrote to the chairpersons of ten schools. The response was one hundred percent favorable.

There was no thought about annual meetings. But the first venture came off in grand style. The group voted unanimously to continue by accepting the invitation by Loren Reid to come to the University of Missouri. At that time I thought this was a miracle. I feel so now, more than ever. Jan Timmons, who acted as reporter for our meetings at K. U., wrote me a letter before Christmas saying that this first Mid-West Basic Course Conference made so much sense, she wondered why in heck someone didn't think of this sooner.

No one can put into words what constitutes the ideal teacher for the first course. But

the teacher makes the course. I feel that the teacher should be a scholar but should give teaching the person high priority. He should be gentle, patient, and compassionate. At times he should play the role of Peter Pan. He should have the touch of a psychiatrist. He should be a kind of missionary that has no connection with race, church, or religion. Always keep in mind that in this course you have more potential for developing the inner man than in most advanced courses in speech communication. (Interrupted by applause and statements of agreement by the audience. Turning to the banquet chairman, Professor Buehler said: "Say, this is going all right, isn't it?" More applause.)

I would like to wind up this visit by quoting a few paragraphs from an article I hope may be published some day:

> James Armstrong, colleague and fellow assistant graduate speech teacher at Northwestern who later became Dean of Men, made an unforgettable remark as we compared notes about our classroom teaching experiences. "Bill," he said, "We are dealing with human stuff." This expression, in common street language, struck me with great force and left an imprint on me for the rest of my professional life. This made me realize that perhaps I should be more concerned about the inner man than academic credibility. My prime mission was to help a student to find himself, to experience various levels of self-renewal, and to grow in self-confidence. This is to say helping the student gain individual sovereignty stands as an ever-present and basic need. This need is especially pertinent for the students in the basic speech courses.
>
> Once a student feels he is making progress towards self-mastery while speaking before groups, he attains a new sense of achievement which carries over into everything he does.

> This generates new levels of self-renewal, growth of mind, builds character, and helps the flowering of personality. This growth of the inner man is not for the moment, but for a lifetime. Such rewards cannot be measured by dollars and cents or a slide rule.

I received a Christmas greeting card, which touched me many years ago, with a postmark from Peru, South America. This card, read in part: "Professor, you won't remember me, but I was a student in your speech class in Green Hall in 1934. I want to wish you a Merry Christmas and tell you that you opened a window for me for which I have been forever grateful. Cordially yours." Across the years I've had many similar responses--many of them which touched me deeply. Perhaps half of these blessed communications have come since my retirement. This all means inner tranquility for me. This also explains why I believe that, for many beginning speech communication students, it is more important to teach the person than the subject. No one can teach the hidden mysteries involving the skills of oral communication. I believe in teaching the person, and the person will find his own orbit for teaching himself.

If I could close by singing a song, I would use these words: "At the moment my tears are dry, but don't ask me to reason why. For happiness is to be with you all to celebrate the birthday of a baby you helped to create." (Standing ovation)

---

Professor Buehler's presentation was repeatedly interrupted with laughter and applause and at times with verbal approval by the audience.

The following remark was made by Professor Buehler some days following the banquet: "After many years of speaking experience, I can't recall such strong and warm empathy from a group of listeners."

# CHAPTER TWO

## Reflections on the University of Kansas

50th Anniversary of Delta Sigma Rho Banquet

ADDRESS FOR THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

OF DELTA SIGMA RHO

(Given in 1960)

Thirty years ago last September, I came to the University of Kansas as Director of Forensics and teacher of Public Speaking. In an interview with the genial, stately Chancellor Lindley, I was reminded that my mission was to put K. U. on the map in college forensics. Interest in debate and oratory seemed to be at a low ebb; an old poster read in big, bold type, "If you can debate, Kansas University needs you." Apparently the former debate coach was begging for talent.

There was a very meager annual budget of about $200, which didn't stretch very far when we consider that all travel was by train and all teams were composed of three members. There were only about six debates a year. There was no debate squad, only separate teams, each having an alternate. Admission was charged for home debates, and they were well-attended by students and faculty. Usually there was a musical number or two furnished by talent from the School of Fine Arts. These debates were featured among the outstanding events on the college calendar.

The year before I came, the University scheduled its first debate with a team from Oxford, England. Fraser Theatre wasn't large enough to hold the crowd. The event was staged in Robinson Gymnasium. Admission charge was 50¢. This event alone made more money for the forensic fund than the normal allocated budget of an entire school year. The subject for debate was perhaps as much a drawing card as the celebrated gentlemen from Oxford. The resolution was: Resolved, that this house oppose the principle of Prohibition. The visitors, of course, were on the affirmative. Malcolm McDonald, son of the Prime Minister of

England and member of Parliament, was a member of that Oxford team as was Mr. Butler, who under Mr. Churchill was Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain for several years. These international debates, except during the war years, became traditional affairs. Until recent years, they were always well-attended. On two occasions since the war, debates with Oxford or Cambridge University were held at regular University Convocations.

An interesting incident in the late '20s, which did much to boost K. U. Forensics, was associated with a generous act by Will Rogers. At the time when Hoch Auditorium was first constructed, I had by a stroke of good fortune, engaged Will Rogers for a single lecture. We had hoped to make a lot of money for our forensic fund from this performance by America's leading humorist. A few weeks before Rogers was to appear on our campus, Fred Stone, who was playing in The Ziegfeld Follies, met with a bad airplane accident. Will Rogers, a close friend of Mr. Stone, offered to substitute for the injured actor and therefore was obliged to cancel his K. U. engagement--but promised to come the following October on Dad's Day, the football date with the University of Oklahoma. Again, he was forced to cancel his engagement. Mr. Rogers, apparently feeling some amends should be made for canceling two speaking engagements, sent his personal representative to spread a little good will on our campus. One day, a stranger appeared at the window of the Business Office and presented a check of $1,000 with Mr. Rogers' compliments. Eight hundred dollars of this was added to the forensic budget.

The following year, a debate team made a two-week tour eastward. On the itinerary were Northwestern, Notre Dame, Michigan University, Pennsylvania State College, Western Reserve University, Princeton, and Rutgers. The favorable record and favorable publicity resulting from this extended tour was influential in enlisting student and administrative support for forensics. Our budget was increased many times the old figure.

Forensics now held a prominent place on the All-University Student Activity Ticket. This policy of supporting forensics has, from that day until now, been steadfastly maintained. I might say however, that compared to athletics, our share has always been very meager. For a period of 14 years, our debaters volunteered to pay for their own meals on debate trips. Since the war, our teams were limited to $1.50 per day for meals. This year is the first time in more than 30 years that K. U. debaters enjoy full payment of their regular meals.

There have been pronounced revolutionary changes in forensics everywhere, especially at our own University. Instead of having a half dozen debates a year, we now have 200. Instead of having single teams of only six-eight people, we now have a dozen or more teams and a working squad of 25 or 30 students. The debate tournament dominates the scene today. About 85 to 90 percent of our debates are of the tournament variety. All tournament debates are of the decision type. We participate in 10 to 12 tournaments every year. Occasionally, we hold a debate on the campus for students and faculty, but no one seems to attend them. Most of our debates of the non-tournament variety are held before off-campus groups, such as civic clubs and high schools.

Our forensic program today has a much broader base and more varied objectives than in former days. It is both co-curricular and extra-curricular. We have a total of nine different speech events every year on the campus other than debates. There are contests composed of Informative Speeches, Entertaining Speeches and Demonstration Speeches for both men and women. These six contests are sponsored and conducted by the Forensic League, an organization made up of students interested in speaking experiences but not interested in college debating and oratory. One contest inaugurated in the fall of 1929 has become traditional at K. U. This contest is called "The Campus Problems Speaking Contest." Another traditional contest is devoted to formal oratory. One speaking event is entirely devoid

of the contest element. This is called the Forensic Review. It is really a series of choice exhibits in the arts and skills of oral communication. In one year, as many as 150 students participated in our overall Forensic Program.

In many ways, this is an historic year in American College Forensics. The oldest Forensic Honor Society--Delta Sigma Rho, of which Kansas University boasts a charter--will commemorate its 50 Year Anniversary.

## MEET THE MIRACLE MAN

(Presented at the Department of Speech and Drama Christmas Festival in December 1968)

Young colleagues and friends, it feels good to be with you at this traditional, departmental Christmas Festival. I do wish you all much joy over the holiday season. So far, so good. Now I want to thank you for your courteous attention for the past thirty seconds. I am about to engage in a hazardous, risky adventure, but with your courageous help I do want to risk introducing someone to you. I would like to present someone I have known for three score and ten years, and he is some guy.

As a child and teenager on a farm, I often stood in wonderment about how this fella got around and what he did. Later I watched his style of action on the cattle ranches of Washington, in a village of France at the close of World War I, on the campuses of half a dozen colleges, and in the cities of Chicago, New York, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Honolulu, Topeka and Lawrence.

I always marveled at his ability to adjust to changing times. First he got around by sled and reindeer, then horse and buggy, then the Model-T Ford, then the propeller airplane, and finally the jets and supersonics.

This fella made a deep impression on me as a child. He gave me my first taste of a banana. Then he gave me my first taste of an orange. But it was more than taste and color and fragrance; it was an experience I shall never forget. Of course, I knew about the candies and nuts. We got walnuts, pecans, filberts, and peanuts galore. Every child got his bag of goodies, but my brother Ernest was a self-appointed family administrator of peanuts. Before we tasted a single peanut, each child made a separate pile of peanuts and counted them. Then the piles were equalized; anyone

having one peanut too many meant that something had to be done. So the extra peanuts were broken in two equal parts. That was my first lesson in equality and fairness.

This fella was always cool, kind, dependable, jolly, and generous. In a way he symbolized the very epitome of the establishment. Yet he was never caught "gapping." He never talked about the generation gap, the communication gap, the credibility gap. None of these gaps ever bothered him.

He was a most easy-going, agreeable, law-abiding person who never led a protest march or issued an ultimatum. He never even tried to get on the K. U. Senate Committee. Yet he was most qualified. He had a sense of tradition, cared about the present, and felt responsible about the future--rare credentials for any individual. He never got in any trouble with the law. Think of the cars he walked by with the ignition key right before his eyes. Think what he could have done in vandalizing houses--the opportunities to break up furniture, smash chinaware and antiques. Think of his chances to commit arson while fooling around chimneys and Christmas trees and think of his chances in stores to be a shoplifter.

With the population explosion, his work load kept getting bigger and bigger. He never complained never entered a grievance, and never went on strike. Think of his poor wife; her husband was always busy, never at home. Here was one woman who certainly had reason to carry the torch for the liberation of women, yet she never raised a whimper.

We never think of what imprint this fella made on our profession. In the area of rhetoric, his contribution has been monumental. Think of the poetry, the drama, the sermons, the editorials, and the billions of letters generated among children. But he had even a greater impact upon the field of communication. Long before the National Society of Speech Communication was born this fella taught the world its one great lesson about communication.

He spread the message loud and clear that man communicates best, not with words--but with gifts. Of all the men who have influenced our profession, he, in a way, stands at the top. Yet among the thousands of M.A. and doctoral theses, I can't even find his name listed in the bibliography.

Now my personal testimony. During three-quarters of a century, I found the quality of life through the avenues of family, hundreds of friends and colleagues. Yet I must confess that among all the good people, I found some things which were a bit tiring and irritating. But I never got tired of this fella. There was always something about him that was invigorating and refreshing. Furthermore, most of my family, friends, and colleagues have gone. But this fella still is around doing his thing in his way. I like to have him around. He always brings me a rush of glad strength. Although some may not like his picture, I want him to keep his whiskers and all his jovial smile and his everlasting, "Ho, Ho, Ho." He is some guy doing his thing in a mysterious way, and what a bag he has chucked full of miracles. So what? This wonderful fella taught me to say, "A very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year to you all."

PROFESSOR BUEHLER'S BANQUET SPEECH

(To the Department of Speech and Drama
Spring Banquet on May 13, 1969)

Hello there colleagues and friends! I am embarrassingly sorry I can't be with you in person on this celebrated occasion. Now I am going to do something that I vowed I would never do--put a speech on tape. It is so unsatisfactory. It's something like holding hands by means of a pencil or kissing your wife with a postal card. Well, there's no feedback. Oh, I've made a few marks where I expect laughter or cheers or boos but what's the use? But I do see one advantage. Should there be heckling of the violent type and eggs and missiles start flying, it is better that this damned machine be smashed than this old grey head bashed in.

Now I don't want to make a speech. I just want to make a friendly, jolly visit. I recall this occasion when it was nothing but a picnic in the Craftons' backyard. There were Mr. and Mrs. Crafton, baby Elizabeth, Margaret Anderson and myself. Oh it wasn't long before we ventured into the Union building with two awards on the docket; the Forensic Man of the Year and the Outstanding Actor. Then came the explosion. Fraser Hall, sometimes called the barn, was remodeled into a glorious University Theatre and soon Speech 1 was made a requirement. Teachers and students quadrupled in number and for a quarter of a century this honor banquet became the highlight of the year for all speech and drama people.

Whoops! I'm sorry. I apologize. I'm off key. I'm talking history. And I learned last semester at the University of Nebraska that students aren't interested in history. They tell me the past is a bucket of ashes. They're interested only in what takes place here and now. Well, if the past is a bucket of ashes, it's pretty hard on your parents. It is rough

on Abraham Lincoln and George Washington and Aristotle and, for that matter, Jesus. Okay. I will join you. So to hell with the establishment. We'll do something different, something never done before. We're going to do it here and now. I am going to give myself an award. And why not? For thirty years I have been giving out certificates, medals, plaques, even money, and there was always that secret pain in my heart. Oh, if I could only get one tiny little medal or some badge of honor, even if it were only a collar button.

Well, tonight we're going to end all this. So a committee, and this was an anonymous committee, was formed, and I was made chairman. Well, right off the bat, the committee had a problem. What name should we use for this award? Well, some suggested "ECB" and some said no, that won't do; only LBJ can get by with initials. Then several said let's make it "Bill"; everybody calls him Bill, even Lynn Osborn. Of course, this is a prerogative of all deans. Well, well, well, then Linkugel, Tom Rea, and Dick Schiefelbusch began to break down and call him "Bill." Well, others wanted to use the term "Prof." Now that had a true ring. It sounded sincere and honorable. And then the youngest member of the committee, being of legal mind, said, "Let's be honest and let's do this in the proper way. Let's see what was on the birth certificate." And the birth certificate reads "Ezra Christian." Now I've been trying to hide that name for 70 years because I don't like it. I know it was pretty sneaky of me but conceit breeds deceit, and pride is a mother of lies and liars.

So Ezra Christian, with the power invested in me as chairman of the committee, I make this honor citation in two parts. Part one is for growth. Upon the matter of physical size and strength there isn't much to show, and you seem to be slipping in your cubicle capacity for food and drink. I'm sorry the committee can't mention growth in maturity or wisdom, but the committee does point out growth in knowledge. Knowledge is that stuff that feeds on itself. You are a late bloomer. And you bloomed forth

best after you were in the sixties and even bloomed better after you were retired as a speech teacher from the University of Kansas. How much of this growth was nurtured by the notion that nothing seals the mind and consolidates it like feelings?

Now the second part of this award is for having fun. Ah ha! There's a three-letter word you can bring out in the open anytime, anywhere: F-U-N. Some spell it so it sounds like personal satisfaction, and others spell it to sound like happiness. You have had fun as a people watcher. And where can you watch people better than in speech classes? You can see all sides of them, even beards and mini-skirts. Well, it's much more fun watching people than watching monkeys or goldfish or cabbage worms. And you have had fun as a nature watcher: the birds, the bees, the trees, the flowers, yes, and those damn dandelions, and we might add the stars, and the sunsets and even the tidal waves and volcanoes. And you have had fun watching the works of man--the creative efforts of man, be it poetry or song, painting or architecture, stamps or coins.

And since your retirement, you have fashioned some special keys for having fun. One key was fashioned from a resolution you made five years ago to annually cut your quota by 50% for rendering judgment over the behavior of others. Oh, you never totally surrendered your right to play God, oh no. You only cut it in half every year.

The other key was fashioned by the search and seizure of opportunities to be grateful. Gratitude is an art. It is a skill to be mastered by endless practice, and you have made some improvement since your retirement. And there is that master key, fashioned in the belief that man's best bet for having the most fun lies in the preservation of the heritage of dignity and humanity of which man is capable. This key has lead you to a fountain of inner happiness.

Now, Ezra Christian, this honor award is conditional. It has strings attached to it. It becomes null and void and is absolutely worthless if you ever use it for self aggrandizement. You must never use it to publicize yourself. You must never mention it to anyone, even your closest friends or members of your family or even to your wife, Lois. This, Chairman Conboy, ends what may be a mission impossible. So here's a P. S.: The committee wishes to announce that it is fitting and proper that this award be given on this day, for exactly at 11:30 a.m., May 13, 75 years ago on a farm near Sterling, Nebraska, divine providence staked out a claim in the firmament of humanity for a nine-pound boy soon to be baptized in German in the name of Ezra Christian Buehler.

# HISTORY OF FORENSICS AT

# THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

(Presented Spring Semester 1964 and published in the Kansas Speech Journal, Fall 1980, Vol. 42, No. 1)

## WHERE DO WE START?

Some form of forensic activity existed among the literary societies the first year the University was in operation in 1867. Over the country in general, intercollegiate forensics sprouted and grew out of the literary societies. Since these literary societies on the prairie land had little or no faculty supervision in their programs of oratory, debate and declamation, they gradually disintegrated and became more like social clubs than literary societies.

While forensic activities declined among the literary societies, they established themselves in various ways within the University. Students were invited to make speeches at class day exercises, commencement activities and chapel services. There were inter-fraternity debates at the turn of the century, and there was a fierce rivalry in the annual debate between students of law and engineering. The trend towards intramural forensics was greatly encouraged and expanded during all the years I was at K. U.

## BEGINNING OF INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSICS AT K. U.

Intercollegiate oratory was initiated in 1884, and our first debate was held with the University of Nebraska in 1895. In oratory we started off with a bang. We entered a state contest here in Lawrence and an inter-state contest in Iowa City. Oratory flourished for

two decades but was plagued with problems related to judging, money, plagiarism, and eligibility. For two decades K. U. sponsored an all-university oratorical contest which stood out as a leading campus event. Although debate came on the scene in 1895, oratory continued to be the dominant forensic activity for nearly a decade. In 1903, due to a dispute over the eligibility of one of our orators, K. U. dropped out of the Kansas Oratorical Contest. There was a sharp decline in oratorical activity until 1921, when Kansas University became an active member of the Missouri Valley Oratorical Association. For the next three decades, our performance in oratory in some ways outshone our performance in debate. During the first 20 years of the Missouri Valley Oratorical Association, K. U. enjoyed an enviable record in oratory.

WHY THE BIG BLOOM IN ORATORY?

There are many contributing factors. High on the list I would mention tradition and heritage. Nationally, oratory was a forerunner of contest debating by two decades. Oratory was in full swing nearly 100 years ago. For the Greeks, oratory was the aristocrat of all forms of art. The orator spoke to the heart of the listener; he appealed to human dignity and the ennobling motives of man. The oration was a creative piece of oral literature.

Time was when an intercollegiate oratorical contest was an exciting, popular campus event. At one state contest at Baldwin, the Santa Fe Railroad ran a special train from Lawrence to Baldwin to accomodate the crowd of K. U. student supporters. Chancellor Snow gave a pep talk at the railroad station, and the K. U. band helped give the orator and cheering students a rousing send-off. When the K. U. orator won, the word got back to Lawrence, and hundreds of cheering students gathered at the railroad station to cheer and celebrate the victory. In a moment of frenzied delight, a group of students derailed and overturned a

streetcar, causing some anxiety that the celebration might turn into a riot.

Oratory among high schools was likewise very popular. I recall the national high school contest when the finalists from five states had a district contest in the municipal auditorium in Kansas City. The house was packed, and the winner would receive a cash award of $500. But what impressed me was that the judges were five state governors in the Midwest.

Fortunately, a goodly portion of these Kansas City finalists came to K. U.; we got more than our share of this fine high school talent. This explains in part why we did so well in contest oratory during my first 15 years at K. U. (1925-1940). At times we had two intramural contests--one for freshmen and sophomores, another for juniors and seniors.

I confess I was partial to oratory, having been a college orator myself in my junior and senior years. In my college nearly ten percent of the male students were out for oratory.

I regret to say that much of the bloom of college oratory is now gone. We still have a modified form of public address, less formal but lacking in any literary style. Oratory is mainly audience and occasion oriented. There are too many distractions today--athletic events, T.V., moving pictures and automobiles that go places. Furthermore, good oratory requires hard work, rugged discipline, patience and creative energy, ill-suited to the modern lifestyle of our college students. We also see the decline in oratory in public life--gone are the Winston Churchills, Franklin Roosevelts and John Kennedys.

## INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSICS IS AN AMERICAN PHENOMENON

All forms of competitive forensics--intramural and intercollegiate--existed and

flourished for the benefit of an audience. Before the days of radio, television, color and sound pictures, and super highways, there was a public hunger for entertainment, information, mental stimulation, and the excitement of competition. I have seen oratorical contests in halls with "standing room only." I have seen students turned away from an international debate. K. U. charged admission to all of its main forensic events during my first 15 years. This helped to supplement our budget.

The first recorded intercollegiate debate occurred between Harvard and Yale in 1892. This is an easy date to remember, for it marks the 400th birthday of Columbus' discovery of America. There was no decision--it was election year, and this was an out-and-out political debate. Within 10 years the notion of intercollegiate debating spread over the country like a prairie fire. The three leading forensic honor societies were formed in the space of five years in the first decade of the century. This marks the time when debate emerged as the backbone for most college forensic programs, and for the last 60 years, debate has claimed about 90% of the time, money, energy and manpower. Forensic activity took hold in a big way, especially in the Midwest and the southern parts of our country.

The American way provided a climate favorable to the rise and development of competitive forensics, oriented to educational goals at the college level. The time was ripe in our culture for the growth and flowering of forensic activity. This activity was born in a climate of "free speech U. S. A.," linked with the art of speech-making as an academic discipline at the college level.

MORE ABOUT K. U.

When I came here in the fall of 1925, Chancellor Lindley called me into his office. He got to the point in a hurry. He leaned forward in his chair, and in his most dignified

manner he said, "Buehler, I want you to put K. U. on the map in forensics." I got the message. The top man believed in forensics. I got the impression he thought it more important to do well in forensics than in football. There had been several turnovers in the men in charge of forensics, and when I started, little did I dream I would hold that post for nearly 40 years.

This was some kind of a record. To my knowledge, there have been very few men in charge of forensics at the same school for so long a time. Today there is a heavy turnover of people in charge. Graduate assistants, working on advanced degrees, have much of this responsibility now.

The goals and problems were interlocked. High on the list of problems was money. If you're going to have an intercollegiate program, you have to travel, and this costs money. We had a meager annual budget of $250-300--the lowest of any school in our conference. My second concern was to broaden the base of forensic involvement of many kinds. I didn't want to build just a stable of champion debaters. I saw educational and personal values in intramural speaking events. I also strongly believed the products of our labors should be shared and enjoyed by audiences, on and off the campus. The off-campus audiences might include civic clubs, high school groups, culture centers and radio listeners.

My mission was based on the notion that our forensic program should give more opportunity among 5,000 students for some kinds of experience in either intramural or intercollegiate forensics. I am pleased to report this program continued to expand until World War II.

During my first year, a squad of ten debaters took part in ten intercollegiate debates on four separate subjects. The second year we had 18 debaters using five different questions and a squad of fifteen freshmen using the high school question. They gaves debates before live audiences in a score or more of high

schools. We used many types of debate--decision and no-decision debates, open-forum, audience shift of opinion and radio debates. Expansion of intramural activities was more pronounced than the intercollegiate programs.

## THE UNIQUE ROLE OF INTRAMURAL ACTIVITIES

I want to tell you about one contest that was well-supported for 39 years. It was called the annual "Campus Problems Speaking Contest." It had the features of an oral editorial and was always held in the fall. First we had tryouts by 15 to 30 students, each speaking four minutes, giving the gist of what they would say in the finals. A board of three faculty judges selected the best eight speakers for the finals by secret ballot. A few days later, these eight finalists had eight minutes each to determine who was the one who would receive the winning silver cup provided by the Men's Student Council. In this way, vital campus issues were brought out in the open, and the winning speech was thoroughly reviewed in the Daily Kansan.

Of course, oratorical contests were a standard fixture. On election years we had an extemporaneous speaking contest on American politics. On two occasions, we had a contest on Kansas problems, and the governor of the state came to be the chairman of the meeting. I recall two debates on red-hot campus issues--Resolved: That Hell Week Should Be Abolished, and Resolved: That The Dove Should Be Abolished. (The Dove was a very controversial publication of the extreme left variety.) Varsity debaters were usually excluded from these debates. We also featured competition among organized houses and Greek organizations. We had three contests for women and three for men. These events featured speeches of entertainment, of information and of demonstration. All these intramural speaking events did much to stir up interest and support for the whole intercollegiate forensic program. Best of all,

the cost was very little--perhaps five percent of our entire budget.

OUR MODE OF OPERATION

In general, forensic activities were under the jurisdiction of a senate committee called the Forensic Council, composed of five appointed faculty members and myself. This board helped give forensics a good image and lent support to my administration. However, in 1946, at the recommendation of the Chancellor, the University Senate voted that the Forensic Council be dissolved.

During the early years, we used a three-man debate team and traveled mostly by train. Because of our limited budget the debaters were asked to pay for their own meals so we could have more debate trips. This practice was honored for 16 years.

Delta Sigma Rho Honorary Forensic Fraternity was organized at K. U. in 1910, and this was a big help to our program. Delta Sigma Rho ranked well with Phi Beta Kappa. Members of Delta Sigma Rho helped with our general debate program, were used as judges for high school debates, and were also used to assist in directing and coaching the freshman teams here at K. U. We elected an average of four Delta Sigma Rho members every year. We also charged admission for all kinds of forensic events. Dual debates were common with Nebraska, Missouri, Drake, Oklahoma and other schools. The affirmative team would stay at home, the negative traveled. There was no single national topic; the schools would settle on a question by mutual agreement. When tournament debating first came on the scene, varsity debaters were limited to one question and one tournament per semester. When tournament debating became dominant after World War II, this rule was abandoned.

We always gave high priority to debates before audiences, on and off the campus and

over the radio. We had regular bookings before certain high school audiences and civic clubs in Kansas City, Kansas, Iola, Atchison, Topeka, Ottawa, Garnet, and Lawrence. Of special interest were debates during legislative years. They involved joint sessions of the Kansas Legislature, with the governor as chairman, the Supreme Court members as judges, and Topeka High School students invited by the hundreds to fill the gallery. This took a lot of extra work, but it was most rewarding as an educational venture and as good public relations. It also was a motivating force for the students to do their best.

## A STROKE OF GOOD FORTUNE

One stroke of good fortune did so much to help put K. U. on the map in forensics. Will Rogers gave forensics at K. U. a big boost and went to his watery grave in Alaska not knowing the good he did for me and our struggling forensic program. It all happened this way. Hoch Auditorium, seating some 4,000 people, was scheduled to be completed in 1929. I was looking for a way to raise money to supplement our meager forensic program. I conceived the idea of engaging Will Rogers, perhaps the most popular lecturer of the day, to give the first public lecture in the new Hoch Auditorium. I heard Mr. Rogers' fee was $2,500, but due to my persuasion or a typographical error, I received a letter of agreement from Mr. Rogers' manager that we could have Mr. Rogers for $1,000. I accepted the offer.

At about the same time a new K. U. lecture course committee was formed. When this committee heard about my plans to have Mr. Rogers, they brought pressure on me to release Mr. Rogers to be the headliner of the new lecture course. His name alone would assure success of the season ticket sale of the entire lecture course. I released my claim to Mr. Rogers with the stipulation that forensics would get the first $1,000 of profit, and we would split 50/50 on the balance. Season ticket sales were

brisk. Unfortunately, Fred Stone, Mr. Rogers' friend, who had a leading part in The Ziegfeld Follies, broke his leg in an airplane accident. Mr. Rogers agreed to substitute for Mr. Stone and cancelled his K. U. engagement. But he agreed to come the next fall on Dad's Day when we played Oklahoma in football. For some reason, this date was also cancelled.

A short time later, a personal representative of Mr. Rogers' appeared at the K. U. Business Office and presented a check for $1,000 with Mr. Rogers' compliments in settlement for breaking his two speaking engagements. The Forensic Council was allowed $800 of this check. This was some windfall. It was more than two years of our total annual budget. This money was used in scheduling two prestigious debate tours among the Big Ten and Ivy League schools, including Northwestern, Michigan, Michigan State, Notre Dame, Penn State, Rutgers and Princeton Universities. These tours lifted the image of intercollegiate forensics at K. U. The publicity worked miracles, and our budget more than tripled in a few years.

SOME EPISODES I CHERISH MOST

I am pleased to pick out some highlight incidents I cherish very much. I was impressed and pleased with the caliber of students we had, especially in debate. In the year 1939-40, there were ten Summerfield Scholars on the squad, and 100% of our seniors were Phi Beta Kappas. During the last five years of the '30s, we had one K. U. honor man on the squad each year.

Now, as I look back, I am impressed with the quality of our opponents. Here are a few names: Russell Long of Louisiana, Fred Seaton of Kansas State, Karl Mundt of South Dakota, Ted Sorrenson of Nebraska, and I will never forget the captain of the Northwestern team in 1929, Arthur Goldberg.

While we are on this glory road, I want to mention the Delta Sigma Rho Golden Jubilee--1956 in Chicago. At the big banquet, Senator Hubert Humphrey was our featured speaker. He was flanked by Edmund Muskie, Governor of Maine, and Wayne Morris, Senator from Oregon. There were a score or more of prominent public men of Delta Sigma Rho there.

We were in one historic invitational debate which was especially gratifying to me. In the spring of 1945, K. U. was chosen by the West Point Military Academy for a debate to be held before the officers and senior class at the academy. The question was--Resolved: That Compulsory Military Training Should Be Abolished. Well, this debate wound up having exciting moments for me, because we won the debate 2-1, and, moreover, I had my first commercial airplane ride while my boys, Orville Roberts and Jean Moore, traveled by train.

I always felt that one of the finest things we did during World War II was to provide a Student Speakers' Bureau on behalf of the war effort. We gave from 25-30 off-campus programs during the school year. The programs were geared for entertainment, information and patriotic inspiration. We usually had from two to four members on a team.

From the standpoint of rivalry, Texas was our favorite school. There wasn't the slightest feeling of bitterness and antagonism between the schools. We never minded losing to each other--what mattered was to put on a good show. The Texans always were good audience speakers. As the Dean of our Law School observed, "Give a Texas debater 60 seconds, and he will warm the heart of any audience." When we went to Austin, we usually had four debates on three different subjects, all before different audiences. We followed a similar pattern when Texas came to visit us.

From the standpoint of a single forensic triumph, I suppose I have to mention winning the West Point Tournament in 1952. I give Dr. Kim Giffin credit for this. He had complete

charge of the team. I also want to give Dr. Giffin credit for dreaming up and setting in motion the Heart of America Debate Tournament. This tournament stands out as one of the finest in the country.

Frankly, there are many side blessings I have treasured. I could mention travel. I did get to visit over 75 colleges and universities in person, and I got to know quite well twice that many colleagues, many of whom became good friends. There were about three score of these colleagues who rose to the top echelon to structure and shape our destiny as educators of Speech Communication. But best of all, I think my experience in forensic education helped me to grow up and to be a more mature, compassionate person. It has greatly enriched my life.

## SOME THANKSGIVING THOUGHTS

(1974)

I had a dream about an ancient custom where family Thanksgiving Day celebration was reserved only for people in their 80th year on earth. Therefore, this is my one and only chance to observe this ancient custom. I will do this with confessional and philosophical overtones. I will skip the Pilgrims, the turkey, and the cranberries. It seems like Christmas is for children; Easter is for the rabbits; and Thanksgiving Day is for octogenarians.

Gratitude is not a gift by nature, like freckles or red hair. It is more of a skill, an art, that is developed through much practice and effort. Some may never discover in a lifetime that happiness is being grateful for what you are and what you have. Youth finds it difficult to practice gratitude. The young tend to take things for granted. The elderly, having so much invested in life, have more stuff to work with to develop the talent of Thanksgiving. Even at the age of 80, I confess my meager accomplishment in this. But in my awkward and fumbling way, I will point out some things for which I am thankful. However, this will be very skimpy.

I am grateful for my genes. I am grateful that my parents gave me a biological plus on my birthday, May 13, 1894. I am glad that on Christmas mornings, brother Ernest would gather all the peanuts brought by Santa Claus and Sunday School packages and divide them in exactly equal amounts, even to a fraction of a quarter, for us four boys. This was democracy at work in the home.

I am grateful that my red-haired high school English teacher, Bessie Foster, once made a remark that I never forgot. She said,

"Things closest to us we talk about least, and those we love most, we hurt the worst."

I am grateful that late in life I heard a speaker say, "The most common thing people have in common is their difference." Another said, "We see the world not as it is, but as we are." Still another pointed out, "The smell of hay for the lover is not the same as it is for the politician." A rush of glad strength came to me from Buckminster Fuller when he wrote, "You and all men are here for the sake of the other man."

Now, for a few things closer home.

I am grateful that soon after your mother left us, Bower Aly, who lost his wife leaving five small motherless children, said to me, "Bill, above everything else, we must keep the family together."

I am grateful to Dolph Simons who advised me in the summer of 1947 to take my teenage girls on a long auto trip for two or three weeks. We went to Canada, New York, Vermont, etc. Remember?

I am grateful that I found Lois to join me in seeking a new life with ventures of happiness and self-renewal, and for all she has done for us as a family.

I am grateful to my three colleagues, Tom Rouse, Bower Aly, and Leroy Laase. Were it not for them, I would never have been invited to teach after my retirement at the universities of Texas, Hawaii, and Nebraska.

Finally, and above all, I give thanks from the depths of my heart that we can celebrate our first Thanksgiving as a family that came to full bloom with the help of Lois who has now won THE MUMSIE AWARD.

Best of all, we have had in various ways a lot of fun for more than a quarter of a century, and there is much more to come. Good times will come in new styles as generated and

devised by our grandchildren of whom we are very proud. Frankly, I am most grateful I can celebrate this--my 80th Thanksgiving. I know so many who didn't make it.

# CHAPTER THREE

## Examining the Speech Act

## DELTA SIGMA RHO–TAU KAPPA ALPHA DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARD

### E. CHRISTIAN BUEHLER

Teacher, scholar, author, and professional leader, has been consistently in the forefront of speech education. His contributions have ranged from the basic course through the graduate and adult levels. As a Director of Forensics he has championed responsible and effective discussion of public issues, inspiring students to excellence and earning respect for himself and his contributions in the academic community. His was the vision and leadership that brought Delta Sigma Rho through critical times and established its financial foundations. His integration of educational philosophy, integrity of purpose, and warmth of personality have been a significant influence in the lives of all who have known and worked with him. To the affection of his many students, the respect of his colleagues, and the recognition of his work in adult education should be added that of Distinguished Alumnus of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha.

BOOKLET PREPARED FOR THE

ANNUAL STEELWORKERS INSTITUTE

(The following information was taken from a booklet prepared by Buehler for the Annual Steelworkers Institute at the University of Kansas. The booklet was first used in 1974 and was reprinted in 1975 and 1976 for use at the Steelworkers Institute.)

## Human Action and Reaction

Moses didn't get his show on the road until he was 80. Having just turned the corner of the four score mark, I will try to get my kind of show on the road. I do this partly in celebration of my birthday and partly to mark my 28th anniversary with the Steelworkers Institute at the University of Kansas.

Having been lost most of my life in a kind of human wilderness midst the books and people of seven different universities and more than 200 groups from the ranks of labor, business, and the professions, I am moved to prepare this vestpocket edition of some things I have learned concerning people and the "what" and "why" of their behavior.

The three main branches of study of this Institute are: human communication, human relations, and human motivation. Although these three are tightly interlinked, my focus will be on human motives.

Before we take a close look at the invisible wheels that drive us to action, some thoughts are in order about that 13-letter word communication. Communication is life itself. Henry Drummond once wrote, "Death is that state of the body when it can no longer communicate with its environment." We like to think of man as the champion communicator among all living creatures, because of his intelligence and the

gift of speech and language which he invented. Yet, so much of his life is wrapped up with non-verbal communication over which he has much less control. Mother Nature pours out a constant flow of messages from the stars, trees, flowers, birds, insects, darkness, light, fire, gravity, humidity, weather, and so on. Time talks with overwhelming eloquence. You may change the calendar, but it won't affect pregnancy. There are messages in hunger, thirst, and physical pain. There are messages in hurt feelings, emotional upsets, laughter, and tears. At least some of the non-verbal meanings are acts of intent. We communicate with action, for it speaks louder than words. Money talks. So do machines, flowers, guns, food, whistles, flags, and so on. A picture may be worth a thousand words. Of course, we are a word-oriented society, even if only one-third of human communication comes by what we say and write. The miracle of language stands as man's supreme device for shaping his destiny. It is the key to his salvation and self-destruction. One word can break up a home, destroy a friendship, settle a strike, change the course of history. Words are a part of what we are. We have to have words to think and dream.

## Barriers and Handicaps to Communication in the U.S.A. Today

1. KNOWLEDGE EXPLOSION - Communication and knowledge are interdependent. As the volume of knowledge increases for the nation, there is a corresponding increase in the volume of ignorance for the individual. I confess that I may know four or five times as much now as I did when I graduated from high school, but compared to what there is to be known, I am four or five times as ignorant.

2. POPULATION EXPLOSION - Our cities become more densely crowded. Too many people are getting in the way of each other, causing tension and friction. Everyone is lonely in a

menagerie of strangers. Good neighbors are hard to find when things are crowded.

3. NOISE EXPLOSION - Noise pollution gets progressively worse. There are sound amplifiers, radios, music boxes, and the like. Increased numbers of automobiles, motorcycles, airplanes, helicopters, air conditioners, and so forth interfere with sleep and good listening conditions.

4. THE IMAGE OF VIOLENCE - From every direction we are fed the image of violence by radio, T.V., press, and movies. This creates an atmosphere of tension as opposed to peace and tranquility. This makes for a "trigger happy" people with an irresponsible attitude towards the use of power words, vulgarity, and profanity. Shock waves which jar the public sense of decency and morality tend to foul up the lines of communication. This is demonstrated by the messy Watergate affair.

5. THE NUMBERS GAME - Put your money in a bank, drive a car, get a job, serve your country, or get married, and you get tangled up in numbers and electronic computers. You cease to be a person and become just a walking number. This destroys the individuality of the sender and receiver of messages. It takes the human element out of communication. Numbers talk louder than people.

6. THE "GAMESTER" COMPLEX - I am not talking about the world of sports where fair play and sportsmanship prevail. Beyond our world of sports, we Americans are becoming a "scoreboard-conscious" people. We overreact in playing games to score a point--to win a victory that is motivated by vanity, egotism, and self-aggrandizement. A climate of "gamesterism" creates mental and emotional sets which blind the communicators to what is so, wise, or just. Investment in egocentric emotions bankrupts the mind.

Now we come to the very heart of my subject--"people." Knowledge and skills in the

context of communication and human relations must come from what we know about people. Here lies the blood, muscle, and nerve of this pamphlet. The more you can understand yourself and others, the better the chances are that you will succeed in human relations and communication.

Look at man. He is the most complex living creature on earth. He is the masterpiece of the creative process, made in the image of God. Yet he is always doing a balancing act, poised between being an angel or a savage jungle beast. He has figured out a way to split the atom and fly to the moon, but he knows so little about himself. C. G. Jung, a famous psychologist of our century, makes much of the point that psychology still has a long way to go to get a fuller understanding of man's behavior. "Know thyself," the slogan of the ancients, is still a fitting slogan for us today.

From the time of Adam and Eve to Richard Nixon, people have pondered the mysteries of human behavior. Midst all our perplexities we get one message loud and clear--people need each other. "You and all men are here for the sake of the other man," writes Buckminster Fuller.

A motivating force is an invisible driving force, a dynamo generating deep desires, wants, and pulls which create strong tendencies towards various kinds of actions and reactions. We often hear the words, "Yes, I did it, but I just couldn't help it."

Each person carries within him his own individualistic pattern of dynamos which differs from anyone else's. We hear the expression, "I want to do my thing in my own way." There are many sides to the human personality: the physical, mental, social, moral, professional, spiritual, emotional, sexual, the romantic. A motivating force will vary in strength and appeal among individuals according to heredity, age, sex, environment, training, and state of health of body and mind.

My categories of motivating forces have been evolving in substance and meaning for more than 40 years. My main hope is that they will serve as catalyzing agents to help us learn more about ourselves and our fellow creatures, so that we may be more responsible communicators in our pursuits of happiness.

Motivating forces are mysteriously integrated to make up the total dynamics for the ways we think, feel, and act. Think not of this list of forces as you would view a package made up of marbles, apples, and chewing gum. They are more like elements of chemistry which react on one another with catalyzing force. Sex alone, all by itself, can cause one kind of action, but mix it with intense pride, then you better look out. Someone might get killed. Motivating forces react on each other in different ways on different people.

I list a total of 10 motivating forces. However, I usually think of man as a kind of two-legged animal, driven by a 2-cylinder, invisible engine. One cylinder is made up of biological parts; the other contains elements of the sociological or psychological, sparked by the human ego. One concerns life for the individual and the species, and the other concerns the fulfillment and enjoyment of life. In a figurative sense, the biological represents the jugular vein, while pride strikes at the solar plexis of the human being.

People are Motivated by the Biological

Man is a specimen of the animal kingdom and is governed by the law of survival. Like cats, birds, and snakes, he must eat, sleep, rest, eliminate wastes and stay healthy. Man must provide himself with food, clothing, beds, houses, sewers, hospitals, and so on. We are familiar with the T.V. ad, "If you've got your health, you've got just about everything." An army fights on its stomach. Prison riots start in the mess hall. "For the hungry man,

food is God," says Ghandi. Rice, meats, and grain are worth more than war.

The animals went in the ark two-by-two. Here is where sex comes into the picture. The core meaning of sex has its roots in the family, the cornerstone of society. Yet despite all the fuss about birth control and the population explosion, babies keep coming into the world out of wedlock, and the crime of rape remains on the increase. We are more like animals than most of us are willing to admit.

Of course there is another dimension of sex which has deep sociological meaning. King Edward VIII of England gave up his throne for the one woman he loved. What is beautiful about sex appeal rings out in literature, poetry, and song. Sex is an inescapable part of the total person. The deeper, fuller, and more sublimated level of love in the romantic sense opens the way for companionship, self-renewal, and creative energies to fill the cup of happiness.

Although the crucial stuff of life for man is composed of food, sex, sleep, and so on, there is much more for civilized man to think about. So let us do some role-playing. Let's play like the crucial issue is: ARE BABIES NECESSARY?

Suppose some diabolical power from another planet would release a mysterious mist which would envelop the earth, totally destroying the miracle of babies being born on this planet for the next 20 years. Suppose in this span of time, a new Rip Van Winkle takes his long nap, waking up near the end of the century. What would our world be like after this total moratorium on bringing babies into the world?

Rip would wake up slowly, take a big yawn or two, stretch himself, look around, and notice that all the schools were closed. "Well," he says to himself, "No more PTA meetings, no teachers' strike, no more fuss about school busing." Rip is distressed to find the organizations of Boy Scouts and Girl

Scouts no longer exist. He wonders what has happened to all the bicycles. The toymakers are now bankrupt. The dairy industry, without its main milk drinkers, is almost extinct. Old Rip is really shook up to find that Christmas is only a legend. Here and there he might find a jolly old Santa Claus made of wax in a museum. Rip is dumbfounded to see the weird turn of events in the Women's Liberation Movement. Now there is only one class of women--the barren ones--"the demothered class." They still have their protest marches but for different reasons. Now they carry bright, blazing banners with slogans "GIVE US BACK MOTHERHOOD." The institution of marriage has all but collapsed. Rip especially feels sorry for the elderly people crowded in old folks homes with the anguish of loneliness, compounded by the absence of the "show and tell" game parents love to play with pictures and tales of their grandchildren. Of course, Old Rip wonders what happened during his slumbers to all that fuss about "pot," and the "pill" and the "Pope." He is disturbed that "family planning" and "population explosion" no longer appear in the headlines. Legal abortion has been a dead issue for 20 years. No one worries about juvenile delinquency. There are no juveniles.

Rip is pleased to see few signs of war or marching armies of teenagers. He says to himself "That's good." "Elders who make laws should do the marching and fighting." He thinks a drafted army of elders would be a farce. While wars between nations seem to have vanished, violence and killing among elders have escalated to alarming proportions. Now old men and women, embittered with life, are more than ever neurotic, self-centered, irritable and hostile towards one another. Their deep frustrations and feelings of despair drive many to drugs, alcohol, homicides, suicides, and the madhouse.

Rip senses that something drastic has happened to the quality of life. There is no future. The old virtues of "FAITH, HOPE AND CHARITY" have lost their meaning. There are no

newborn babies to keep mother love alive. The Christian idea of becoming like a child before you can enter the kingdom of heaven is just so much tommyrot. There are no children to convey the message.

The moral of all this is that man is more than a biological creature. He does not live by bread alone. There is much more to human life than mere survival. Man has to have something to live for.

## People are Motivated by Pride

As I relate to this motive I'll use such familiar terms as ego, conceit, vanity, self-esteem, pride, self-importance, and dignity. These terms convey shades of meaning from the ignoble to the noble.

If you look for the meaning of pride, you might skip the dictionary and answer these questions: Did you ever feel hurt? Have you ever felt insulted, ignored, unwanted, neglected? How do you feel if someone calls you a liar, a dummy, a coward, a slut, a pig? What happens when you are deeply offended? Do you know what it feels like to be discriminated against or to be labeled as a second-class citizen? If these questions reach you, then you begin to understand how the human ego can cut deep into all kinds of human relations. Your ego can do much to give you traits of personality and to structure your character. Here is the key to the quality of life for both the individual and society.

Pride may open the flood gates of pain and misery with feelings of fear, anger, arrogance, embarrassment, hate, shame, anxiety, and loneliness. On the other hand, it can also open the floodgates of joy and happiness and can give you feelings of belonging, freedom, love, hope, confidence, companionship, and so on.

The ego can take on strange powers when linked with another motive. Parlay pride with sex and you risk violence. Look what happened to John the Baptist. Parlay pride with law and order and you risk a crime. Pride is the father of the white lie and the grandfather of the Watergate coverup.

Pride built the great pyramid of Egypt 5,000 years ago. This structure, 40 stories high, composed of 2-1/2 million stone blocks, some weighing many tons, still stands as the world's largest structure. This is a monument to kingly vanity.

We see all kinds of signs of pride at work every day. We see it in the ways people dress, grow hair, wear glasses, jewelry, and uniforms. We see it in parades, demonstrations, even streakers. We see it in the scramble for honors and awards, in schools, and on fields of sports. We see it in the women's lib movement. We see a lot of it in the area of politics, business management, labor unions, military, and school administration. Much of this is the rank, office, and position of power. Much of this is harmless. Some of it is good, some noble. Some of it is bad, with no regard for morality or human welfare. Some of it is sheer aggrandizement and worship of false gods as demonstrated in the Watergate affair and the struggles of Tony Boyle. An ancient proverb says, "Pride can be a sorrowful virtue."

Every building on our campus is named after some person as a gesture of honor and recognition. Note how pride and dignity work in the broader context of society. Pride drove us to be the first to land on the moon. Wars often turn out to be a bloody game for honor and glory for the winner and disgrace for the loser. When neither side can win, diplomats search frantically for a facesaving "cease fire," so each side can salvage some honor and glory. Diplomats cry for peace, but always peace with honor.

Look what ego mismanagement can do to the safety, health, and well-being of society.

Excessive use of drugs and alcohol is largely rooted in ego reinforcement. More than a third of our fatal auto accidents are caused by drinking drivers. Four out of five inmates in state prisons are there because of drugs or alcohol. The call "buckle your seat belt" rubs the ego the wrong way. The safety council of Australia reports that by mandatory use of seat belts automobile fatalities dropped 20%. Our safety council estimates full use of seat belts would save 14,000 lives annually.

The sense of pride and self-importance strikes deeply in the circle of home and family. It is a main source of divorce. It is a main cause for 500,000 teen-age boys in the U.S.A. running away from home each year. It is the main cause for many labor disputes.

On the one hand, pride may have no social conscience when it is self-centered. On the other hand, when it is in the form of personal dignity, it can richly reward the individual and society as a whole. At the more noble level, it has done and can do wonders to improve the quality of life. This nation was founded on the rock of freedom. This motive of dignity gave us the Bill of Rights and the civil rights movement. The religions of the world proclaim the blessing of humility. The Christian religion teaches us "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." The Catholic Church shows the stroke of genius with its system of confessionals to protect and preserve one's sense of self-importance and inner dignity. At least there is a kind of immunity for committing a sin in the public eye.

It is something that a generation ago in Montgomery, Alabama, one lone woman with a compelling sense of dignity could not bring herself to stand up in the back of a bus. This triggered a renaissance of freedom and dignity among Blacks and minority groups of our country. What a noble image of what can happen in the U.S.A. Here is a snapshot picture of this great motive with hidden power for man's salvation. Leonardo da Vinci saw the light

when he said, "I want to preserve liberty, the most precious thing that man possesses."

## People are Motivated by Education

Education is a lifelong process for activating the mind and bringing forth the growth of the inner man. The mind is a living turbulent part of man ready to take off who knows where. Man is forever curious to know, to find out things, and to make productive use of his findings. There is an old saying, "Knowledge Is Power." The person who knows always has the advantage over the one who does not know. Knowledge takes on special value when we find ways to use it creatively for human enjoyment and pleasure.

Modern man has a great advantage over people of ancient times. He has the keys to unlock vast storerooms filled with mysteries, discoveries, and experiences, preserved from man's educational adventures of the past.

Americans have always given high priority to education. Today we have reached a certain level of education for which we spend fully 10% of our gross national product. The desire to learn is interwoven with the biological, to make a living, and the feeling of self-importance. We need knowledge to survive and want to know as a matter of pride.

## People are Motivated by Religion

Man has a spiritual side to his nature. Unlike lower animals, he has a soul and hungers for its life and security. In response to this need, he has developed various systems of religion. Religion has existed in some form since human history began. Anthropologists tell us that no people exist without it. Religion has made its impact upon governments, politics, colonization movements, cultured

people, moral standards, wars, and all forms of art.

Religion supplies man's emotional needs. A person's religious belief is usually an intimate and personal matter, often reinforced by his sense of self-importance. This motive, tied to self-esteem or inner dignity in the name of religious freedom, was a potent force in the birth and founding of this country. Unfortunately, intense loyalty to a religious belief may also create a deep-seated, stubborn, and unyielding prejudice which can be a serious handicap in interpersonal communication.

## People are Motivated by Logical Thinking

"Cool it!" This two-word expression can save many lives and a lot of trouble. "Whom the Gods Would Destroy They First Make Angry" is a famous proverb. Logic can serve as a kind of safety valve to help us avoid violence when we are blinded by anger. "Cool it" is especially important under extreme emotions of vanity and pride. Half of our homicides are not committed by common criminals but are happening among friends, relatives, and acquaintances. The one important role of this motive is to serve as an agent of defense, of self-protection. This motive helps us to stop kicking the thermometer. However, in a larger and more constructive sense, here lies the key to reason and common sense. Here is the master key for the inventive mind to find ways to put things together and test things out. Let the test tube talk. Our modern world with all its marvels of science and invention is a tribute to logic. The logical processes call into play the laws of mathematics, physics, chemistry, electronics, and all sciences. Our steel mills, television, and space travel all were born and shaped in the bosom of logic.

But there is a joker in the pack. Logical thinking isn't easy. It is hard work. Henry James, noted psychologist, once remarked: "Only one person in ten can think logically,

and he can do it only one-tenth of the time." Fortunately, Henry Kissinger can do better than that.

## People are Motivated by Law and Order

There may be little glamour about the term "law and order." It has some negative emotional overtones. We like the idea of order. This suggests organization, neatness, and efficiency for doing things. However, the word law may create the image of some kind of authority that has been devised to take the joy out of living. This can grab an ego the wrong way. Mr. Citizen says, "I want to do my thing. I don't want some crazy law to get in my way." We hear some people say, "A policeman is a pig." Law has a more unpleasant sound for the young than for the elderly.

At times I have had mixed feelings about whether or not "law and order" should be included in my list of motivating forces. But I can't think of the human race without it. Man simply has to have law and order to survive. It is part of his biological make-up. We get the meaning of this by watching mother nature at work--the ants, birds, bees, etc. Even pigs on the day they are born are given individual assignments where to go to the bathroom and have a private eating place. Obviously, we need law and order to protect us from chaos and anarchy. It is difficult for us to imagine what life in the world would be like if we could totally tear out the contributions of Moses, the Constitution, and even the local police force and fire department. We need rules and regulations to raise a family, run a school, a garden club, a labor union, a ball game. After all, laws are man-made for his convenience. In a world of change, he can change them. Our Constitution has been amended 25 times.

## People are Motivated by the Mystic

Most people, in various ways and to various degrees, are influenced to do things on the basis of intuition, superstition, laws of chance, dreams, signs in nature, premonition, astrology, and fortune tellers. There are hidden controls which can trigger action in a decision-making process. Some people find comfort in this as a shelter from taking full blame for their mistakes and foolish deeds. As Geraldine in the Flip Wilson Show would say, "That wasn't my fault; the Devil made me do it."

There are many stories in the Bible which tell us how dreams caused human behavior. Even the Greeks placed great stock in the voices of oracles. Hitler relied much on intuition. The armies of France were moved by voices heard by the Maid of Orleans. Great athletes of today are known to carry good luck charms and wear items of clothing to insure victory. Prominent people in government, business, and the military (especially in the Orient) regularly consult those who claim to have clairvoyant powers. The language of the stars may influence the destiny of nations; lottery may decide who will fight our wars, and the toss of a coin can decide an important election.

## People are Motivated by Charity

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" is a line from the Sermon on the Mount. There is also a tender and compassionate side to human beings. This especially shows up among kinfolks, friends, and good neighbors. In the broader social context, sympathy for the unfortunate stands out in the form of hundreds of charity and human relief organizations. Its overtones are at work in the United Nations, the Peace Corps, Meals on Wheels, Nurses Aides, and care for the sick and lonely. Hospitals in America are more heavily supported by private donations and

private services than by public taxation. We are familiar with such organizations as the Community Chest, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, CARE, the March of Dimes, and countless welfare programs to help the sick, the orphans, the homeless, and the victims of tidal waves, earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, etc.

## People are Motivated by a Moral Conscience

Conscience is a personal, individualistic faculty, recognizing the difference between right and wrong in one's own conduct. The dynamics of conscience vary widely from person to person. Conscience is an educated thing. We get most of it at our mother's knee. The trouble is we don't have the same mother, and there is the rub. Usually this motive springs from an inner faith concerning matters of ethics, religion, morals, and patriotism. Since it cannot be completely divorced from one's ego and self-concept, it is often apt to break out in some form of fanatical, antisocial behavior. "Conscience makes egotists of us all," writes Oscar Wilde. It sounds good to hear, "You know in your heart what is right." We take comfort in the motto, "Let your conscience be your guide." This halo-image people commonly attach to conscience is based upon the false assumption that what the heart says is true and good for society. Devils and saints have equal rights to act according to what conscience dictates.

Men have been sent to prison and the gallows because they dared to believe that the world was round. Galileo, the great Italian astronomer, made telescopic observations confirming the fact that the sun, not the earth, was the center of our universe. But churchly opposition based upon a religious conscience could not accept this fact, and Galileo spent the rest of his life in prison. No wonder Gladstone expressed a scornful attitude towards the human conscience when he wrote, "The disease of an evil conscience is beyond the

practice of all the physicians of all the countries of all the world."

Modern times tell us about monks who burn themselves, people who burn the flag and draft cards, arsonists of all kinds, and assassins of public officials and social leaders. This motive of the inner voice of conscience, when caught in a chain reaction of other motives such as religion, sex, money, political power, or pride, may cause a harvest of violence that strikes a blow against human brotherhood.

## People are Motivated by the Artistic

I can hear some of you steel workers say, "What the hell, who cares about how things look? What matters is will it work. Is it practical?" As a farm boy I felt like that. After some four score years, I have some awakening about this. I recall as a teenager how my father looked at the corn rows my brother had made, and after a long moment of silence, he shook his head and said, "Das ist nicht schon" (it isn't pretty). I was shocked. Here midst all the dirt and smell of pigs, cattle, and horses of the barnyard, my dad was concerned about beauty in the cornfield. This made a lifelong impression on me. A decade later, I began to see what the poet meant--"Beauty is a thing of joy forever."

The artistic has an unusual appeal. No nation or culture has been able to escape the urge for artistic expression. Even the lowest savage finds joy, comfort, strength and inner harmony in art, both from the standpoint of the creator and the observer. In the midst of failure, hunger, illness, and prison, the sensation of the aesthetic never leaves the human breast.

We are forever conscious of beauty in nature as revealed by birds, flowers, trees, stars, butterflies, and all living creatures of land and sea. Happiness is to be able to hear a forest praying. Happiness is to find new

beauty in one particular sunset after seeing a hundred others.

The Greeks recognized art as having a connection with goodness. Some philosophers believe that art might be man's secret weapon to conquer the lie. Art of all kinds may bring the world closer to brotherhood. I suspect the great American pianist Van Cliburn may have done more to bring us closer to Russia than a whole marching army with guns and a stockpile of atomic bombs. Art has a mysterious way of talking to people. This year the Mona Lisa is conveying messages on a world tour to Japan and Russia.

## Pulls and Counterpulls

Midst the overall complexity of motivating forces at work, we often experience contrasting or conflicting feelings and reasons for doing something. Life dishes out a mixture of bittersweet. Here are some of the more common pulls and counterpulls.

*Pugnacity and peacefulness--Should we choose to be a hawk or dove? Is it better to fight it out or seek a way of peace? Is there more hope in the "male fist" or "the nailed hands"?

*Safety and risk--Should I take a gamble or play it safe? A small voice says, "Nothing ventured, nothing gained." Another says, "Better be safe than sorry." Risky ventures are for the young. Teenagers play chicken on the highway. The young volunteer for suicide missions. Old people play it safe.

*Construction and destruction--We find satisfaction in putting things together--in building something. On the other hand, some find satisfaction in busting things up--in tearing things down. Here is a pull toward vandalism.

*Action and rest--At times we experience a desire to do something--to be very active. Then again, we have the urge to do nothing--to be indolent and lazy. We alternate between being a worker and a drone. There is always a good market for both pep pills and tranquilizers, sometimes for the same people.

*Self-assertion and self-abasement--At times we become self-assertive, and aggressively push forth the ego in us. Then again we may play the role of self-abasement, of meekness, of modesty. This may vary according to the make-up of one's personality and the shifting moods of the individual.

*Leader and follower--There is something of the leader and follower, master and servant, in most of us. In the game of life, not everyone can be quarterback all the time.

*Likes and dislikes--When it comes to people, things, and jobs, there is a wide variation as to whom and what we like or dislike. When these pulls and counterpulls relate to people, the words love and hate are often used. However, these emotions are often fickle, subject to change, resulting in counteraction and reaction.

## Changing Times Man-Made

In my lifetime I have seen the coming of the telephone, moving pictures, automobiles, radio, airplanes, television, heart transplants, zippers, atomic energy, space travel, electronic computers, and much more. What a world of change, and there is much more to come. All this is man-made. I call it progress. I have no desire to go back to the outhouse, the coal oil lamp, the wash board, and the old icebox. Nothing like this happens among all the inhabitants of the animal world. The beaver and the rabbit are stuck with what nature gave them. Their life style hasn't changed in a thousand years.

The miracle of the mind, with its capacity for growth, for invention, and for energizing ideas to higher levels of achievement, is a unique gift reserved only for us humans. So why gripe about changing times? This world of change is our baby. Our manifest destiny is solely in our hands.

## Communication Gap in Human Differences

The smell of hay to the lover is different from that to the orator or politician. A doll or a baseball do not mean the same to a boy or a girl. A mountain looks different to the artist, the sportsman, the lumberman, the miner. It is not easy to grasp the impelling fact that one key to communication is a common core of interest and experience for the sender and receiver of the message. We see and hear things in this world not as they really are, but as we are. What is trash for one, may be treasure for another.

People, as specimens of the animal kingdom, have much in common. Yet, the most common thing we have is our individual differences. Our intolerance and lack of sensitivity toward the differences in others create an exasperating communication gap. This gap is usually unnecessary--and always unfortunate.

## PROBLEMS UNIQUE TO SPEECH EDUCATION

## FROM BOTH SIDES OF THE LEARNING PROCESS

(Presented on April 13, 1965 at the University of Texas)

My remarks today concern that large area of functional or service courses. These are the courses whose role in speech departments is similar to composition courses in English departments. We often refer to them as practice or performance courses. The great bulk of them may be considered as beginning speech courses, or Fundamentals of Speech. Before we spell out some unique characteristics of speech classes, I propose to probe the professional conscience of young teachers about a philosophical basis for how and why they teach speech. I respect and admire the legal profession for its code of ethics by which it impresses upon young lawyers the nobility of their goals, and I look up to the medical profession for its Hippocratic oath, which has been its guiding light for many centuries. This oath originated from a famous Grecian physician, Hippocrates, and in it he sets forth an ethical code for medical doctors. The profession of speech teachers would attain stature and gain strength if it could identify itself with some code or credo or declaration of faith related to its calling.

A few years ago I suggested to the staff of speech teachers at my university that it would be well for everyone to take stock from time to time of their opportunities and responsibilities as teachers and formulate some philosophical concepts which would reflect some of their basic beliefs and attitudes about their role as speech educators. A short time later I felt I should practice what I preached, and I came forth with a declaration of faith which I read to the group. Perhaps because I read my piece with much dramatic fervor, it was favorably received; therefore, I sent a copy to Robert

Oliver, James McBurney, and Lionel Crocker for their inspection and their opinion. Mr. Crocker replied that his students were using it as a selection for reading in his interpretation classes, and they seemed to like it very much. He urged that it should be published in the Central States Speech Journal. This was done in the Spring issue of 1960. It is arranged in two parts. Part One concerns the student and Part Two, the teacher.

Part One.

I believe of all human functions, the gift of speech is the most miraculous. I believe of all human forms of communication, speech is supreme. I believe if speech were to stop all of civilized living would come to a grinding halt. I believe the ability to articulate is essential to inner harmony, to emotional maturity and mental balance. I believe that if all people could be completely articulate at all times, there would be fewer wars, fewer jails, more stable homes, and more happy people. I believe speech is essential to the growth and flowering of the human personality, and that it provides a way for self-discovery and self-renewal. For many, it is a way of self-expression without brush or pen.

I believe the act of speech is a total process, and when it reaches optimum effectiveness, the whole man communicates. What you are is always a part of what you say. I believe there is no substitute for content in the speaking process. Materials of intellectual worth remain the essence of eloquence. Speech skills may have their importance, but they no more make a speech than clothes make the man. The center of gravity in all oral communication is thought and the idea. I believe you should make self-reliance your cardinal virtue. Heed the words of Shakespeare: "This above all, to thine own self be true." Rely upon your ability. Never be a party to plagiarism or dishonest work; it will plague you as long as you live. You will have to think for yourself, speak for yourself, and act for yourself in

real life. Why not cultivate the habit in your speech class? I believe every student should develop a conscience for truthfulness and responsible speech. He should show sense, not nonsense; sincerity, not cleverness. He should be real and genuine and not act like a ham.

Let teachers and students alike condemn charlatanism, falsehood, and superficiality. I believe speech has no absolutes, and a completely perfect speech has not yet been made. I believe speech offers a lifetime challenge where there can be no final summit of achievement beyond which one can go no higher. I believe the individuality of the speaker is a sacred and valuable asset in the speaking process. I believe, therefore, any student with normal intelligence, normal emotional balance, and normal speech mechanisms may have at his command those personal resources which enable him to make certain speeches which cannot be equaled by any other person. Every student may have that hidden inner know-how to speak, at some times, superbly well.

Part Two.

I believe you as a speech teacher must deal with people rather than mere theory and principle. I believe you must teach with your heart and soul as well as your head. I believe you should enjoy teaching speech, and if the venture is boring, you should seek other occupations. I believe the kind of person you are may be more important than your grade transcripts, the degrees you hold, or your knowledge of the field. I believe your classes may be either the most boring or the most exciting and stimulating which a student may experience in his entire college career. I believe that what happens in the classroom should never be left to the spur of the moment. I believe you should plan, prepare, and be completely tuned up mentally and emotionally for every class session. I believe you should thoroughly brief your students on the nature of the speech class compared to other classes. I believe each student individually should be

challenged to develop his own capacity to the fullest, and that he should compete with himself rather than for grades. I believe, through your classroom craftmanship, you must create a suitable environment by which the student's speaking experience is most rewarding.

The class with ideal group spirit almost teaches itself. I believe you should be fully aware of many human intangibles; you're dealing intimately and closely with human elements. However, your attitude toward human values reflects only your point of view, and remember, it may be fallible. Speeches and speakers sometimes have souls, and the soul part cannot be measured by an all-purpose yardstick that one might use when measuring a student's work in mathematics or in some physical or natural science. Speech development is vital to the maximum personal development of the student. I believe the academic strength of the course should lie essentially in the day-to-day quality of the speeches, rather than the crammed knowledge of text theories. I believe generally a five-minute speech should require five hours of preparation. I believe in all major assignments, which demand careful preparation, the ill-prepared student should never be allowed to speak. I believe you should stimulate, guide, direct and challenge a student toward working out a creative piece in his own way, and when he asks how you want him to do it, you have already failed in your basic mission. I believe you should be a friend and counselor to the student rather than a stern classroom official. Students should like and respect you, but if there must be a choice between the two--heaven forbid--choose the latter. Be their master--the kind that leads, not commands.

So much for the credo. When I first wrote it, I thought it was pretty good, and the Lord thought it was pretty good. But last night when I read it again, neither the Lord nor I thought it was as good as we once thought it was. This, I hope, is a sign of growth.

Now, at this time, I wish to present an inventory of some of the elements of uniqueness concerning speech classes from the position of the student, and I'll list these and make very brief comments:

1. Students are involved in public performance. Central activity calls for making short talks before a group.

2. The class activities draw human equations into play; the class moves and has its being in a social environment.

3. The speech act involves complex processes, including several sciences and arts along with socio-psycho disciplines which govern human behavior such as logic, language, rhetoric, cultural awareness, phonetics, and theories of communication that come into play.

4. Faulty or negative attitudes among students often create extraordinary hazards and limitations in the speech learning experience. Thus, feelings of dread, apprehension, or speech fright, not only deter desirable student motivation but may have a most deadening effect upon the classroom environment.

5. A student's individuality is more of a precious asset and source of strength in the speech class than it is for the student in most other classes. Individuality is a particular attribute which can be capitalized on to a greater advantage in the speech communication act than in most other undertakings in which students engage. It is in many instances the key factor which governs a student's growth and progress.

6. A speech class develops and provides for itself its own laboratory. This

laboratory is not made up of glass, steel, wood, or material equipment; it is made up of people. It is never fixed but is always fluid, movable, and must be created anew with each class session. It is never static. Every laboratory piece is a human being who is appraised, evaluated, judged, and graded constantly. Consequently, class attendance, good listening attitude, and a cooperative spirit contribute importantly to group spirit which is the key to successful work in speech class. No other class is so composed.

7. There are no absolutes or perfect scores in the usual sense, as one might find in mathematics or science or accounting or engineering. This creates unique problems in grading and rating the work done. This can be troublesome for both student and teacher.

8. Success is the stuff that feeds upon itself more in a speech class than in other classes. Self-generated motives are especially rewarding to speech students. A student usually does his best work when he competes with himself rather than for a grade. The out-and-out grade-conscious student seldom does as well as the student who is impelled by a deep desire to develop his oral communication resources. Students who want most to learn and improve their speech abilities usually make better grades than those who want most to make them.

9. Students are not mastering or learning new skills; they are developing insights and abilities to put the old and familiar skills and functions to better use.

10. The spread of interest and ability among students in a speech class

> varies more widely than in most classes. There may be as many as ten entry points in the course programs in mathematics, but only one entry point for a speech class. Some of the problems which grow out of the unique elements which apply to the speech student pose prima facie need for teacher adjustment.

And now I should like to point to a few factors which are unique to the teacher as he carries out his role as a class instructor and a class leader. First is the matter of grading and evaluating a student's work. There are more extraneous considerations here than in most other courses. Obviously in a performance course, the day-to-day quality of performance must count heavily in making out the grade. But how much should performance count in the total grade? How much of the teacher's judgment and evaluation is always sound and reliable? In order to encourage a student, the teacher naturally is personable and sympathetic--often he becomes very friendly. This is the part of the technique for motivating the student. Yet this very technique is fraught with hazards and limitations when it comes to criticizing, evaluating, and grading a student's platform product. Can a teacher who develops a fondness for a student completely detach himself and objectively rate, grade and evaluate this student? Likewise, a student faces hazards and may develop false hopes in this kind of friendly environment. This may be an evironment to which he is not accustomed. A student who has grown accustomed to the hardboiled professors who have chewed him out and some of the teachers who have sour faces is conditioned to the attitude that all professors are of this type. And, thus, he may mistake a teacher's human, sympathetic, and encouraging attitude as a sign that he is doing exceptionally well and should make a run for Phi Beta Kappa after all. He may think he's worth an "A" while the teacher really rates him a solid "C."

Now the second factor to consider is that individuality for both student and teacher is more of a precious commodity in a speech course than in most others. Originality, imagination, and creativeness are uniquely the elements which form the warp and woof for developing speaking effectiveness. While this is truly the measure of all courses, here they carry a higher premium.

The third factor concerns the canons of teaching: motivation and criticism of students. These play a more important role in speech classes than in most others. Researchers in the psychology of learning have long established the thesis that the key to effective learning lies in motivation. The problem of providing sound and productive motivation for speech students is more complex than for most other students. There are more personal equations and social overtones to reckon with in speech-making than in working problems in mathematics or accounting, or doing experiments in chemistry or physics, or in preparing a lesson in history or political science. There is the overriding motivation growing out of the student's inner self, his sense of pride, his sense of belonging and his joy of achievement. There is the important matter of classroom tone or atmosphere; where the proper classroom spirit prevails, the class tends to teach itself. The teacher stands as a potential dynamic, motivating force. He shapes student's motivation from the opening roll-call each day until the final grade is reached. Every word he speaks, every move he makes, every frown and every smile will in some way motivate his students.

The fourth canon of speech teaching concerns criticism. This involves more of an art in a speech class than in most other classes. Criticism is not picking flaws or finding fault; it is a method of evaluating, of appraisal, of gaining a measurement. It takes into account the good and the bad. It involves the process of analysis, of breaking down the component parts, and evaluating each in turn. It results in synthesis; it reaches for a

perspective and seeks to determine what Clarence T. Simon calls a global judgment. Criticism should be as objective as possible. Every speech teacher should be humbly aware that his criticism may be fallible. Thus, this canon of teaching in many ways calls for a skill and an art which is peculiarly different and challenging from that which is demanded in most other classes.

Now, if you will bear with me, I would like to make some observations about speech teachers. I am thinking of the ordinary so-so teacher, and the second class includes the superior or the ideal teacher. I have no persons or group in mind, and I am not aiming this for anybody. I am more or less talking to myself, aware of course that you may tune in. First, what are some of the earmarks of the ordinary, so-so teacher? Well, this species may most commonly be found among the large number of graduate assistants across the country. Their population is by far the largest. Now this teacher is not good enough to recommend strongly, nor poor enough to fire. But he will do in the face of the teacher demands and enrollment pressures. He has a fair grasp of his subject; he has had a sprinkling of courses in the speech communication area; he is able to keep his head above water as a graduate student; he demonstrates acceptable speech habits; he is a pretty good fellow and a good mixer. He is dependable, does his work well enough; he is good enough at housekeeping duties in his classes, in the matter of assignments, grades, keeping records and makes his reports on schedule. He usually attends the staff conferences and meetings and occasionally contributes an idea or two. He engages on occasion in a glass of beer and pizza pie, goes to all the football games, perhaps teaches Sunday School. If it is a girl she probably has a beau and plans to get married, but doesn't know when; and if it's a boy, he may date frequently but marriage is far from his mind, at least for the moment.

Now, let's take a look at the superior or the ideal teacher. But suppose we change the communication gimmick here. Let's suppose Buehler has an interview with a young, promising, bright fellow who is deeply devoted to this profession, and he drops in to visit and talk things over. We'll call him Clint, for short. The name reminds us of a famous speech teacher. And Buehler speaks:

> Well, I just looked over your transcript, Clint, and it looks awfully good. There are a lot of "A's," and best of all they show up on the tough, solid courses. I notice you're well along in your graduate program, and if you keep on like this, you'll sail right through your Ph.D. with flying colors. And by the way, that Phi Beta Kappa key won't hurt you any. Now, Clint, you've done enough course work and done enough teaching to know that the knowledge of your field and a brilliant mind may not be enough to make you an outstanding speech teacher. If a brilliant mind were the sole requirement, all the little Einsteins would set the speech classes afire. But I have news for you, Clint. I have known some of the little Einsteins, and frankly they weren't worth a tinker's darn in the speech class. So this brings up an important question, Clint, but you don't have to answer it now. You might want to think about it for awhile. What should be a speech teacher's greatest concern? To develop a good student? To develop an able speaker? Or to help develop a well-adjusted, character-structured, mature person? I realize that a good student, an able speaker and a mature, real person are interrelated, and the ideal teacher will strive for all three goals. But if you were to rank one of these at the top of the list, what would you say? I know what your grandfather of a hundred generations

ago would say. Well, I tend to go along with him, and I'll tell you why. You see, a brilliant mind, an intellectual type of person, an intellectual genius void of sensitivity to human values or void of social conscience might turn out to be a kind of nut--an educated idiot. A scoundrel or a demagogue highly gifted in the handling of the power tools of persuasion for only personal gain can be a scourge to society.

In this age of social and political turmoil and danger, we need more mature, broadly-educated people, who are well-versed in the needs of humanity and who are bent on using the gift and power of speech with wisdom and cool judgment. This calls for men of character. You see, Clint, that just in the matter of effective classroom craftsmanship a speech teacher needs more than brains. He needs common sense and plenty of the human touch. He works intimately with human beings; he deals with many facets of the human being. A student develops best when he feels at home and has a group environment where his total self has plenty of room to maneuver in an uninhibited and unhampered manner. This student needs a teacher, therefore, who can fill many roles: that of a friend, a counselor, a guide, a critic, a scholar, a leader, a follower, a master, a servant, a genial host, and an attentive guest all wrapped into one. And of course it would be nice if this teacher could be one part philosopher, one part scholar, and one part Peter Pan. The most important task is to provide the kind of classroom atmosphere where a student will want to try out his wings in oral communication ventures in his own way. This is what the student needs. Hence, the teacher must always be a

skilled and able master of ceremonies; he must never give way to his hamming instinct and monopolize the stage. His business is to draw out the best performance of others. In other words, to mix a figure of speech, he must be the punk to keep the fireworks going.

Oh, yes, you mentioned student motivation. Of course, this is the secret of all learning. But it is probably more important to speech learning and student growth than anything else in the speech class. I think it is important for the student to operate from a position of faith--a triple faith. First, he should have faith in the course, and he should have faith in the values that he gets out of directed experience and faith in what you can do for him. Second, he should have faith in you, the teacher. But thirdly, and above all, he needs faith in himself. He needs to believe that success in speaking ability is within his reach. We had a nationally-known psychologist on the campus a short while ago, Dr. Gardner Murphy, who talked about teachers motivating their students. He used an expression to dramatize and impress us with his idea, and he talked about "fire in the belly." The image is a little blinding at first, but after you cool down and think a little, his striking image makes sense. When you are hit in the solar plexus you react. We just aren't used to the "fire in the belly" expression, but it makes about as much sense as "rocks in the head." And you know the old song, "You Gotta Have Heart." The word "belly" isn't as poetic as the word "heart," but maybe more to the point. You can't see your heart, but you can look down and see your belly button. This is the symbol of your entry into life and your coming into this world.

This marks your beginning as an individual, alone on your own, detached from your mother. This world of individuality is yours and yours alone. This natural sacred province is something unique. Herein is housed your world of self. You are the sole trustee of this selfhood. It is your eternal challenge to see that it flowers and unfolds from one level of self-discovery and self-renewal to another. Here is contained the human being, that masterpiece of the creative process, and you, as a speech teacher, can have a part in a ringside seat to see for a period of time the greatest drama and the greatest miracle, the flowering of the human personality.

Now, Clint, this isn't tommyrot. This is something that has happened to me, and I have seen a similar thing happen to scores of students in my classes. In my last year at KU a senior girl dropped into my office one day to visit and tell me about what happened to her in a speech class when she was a timid freshman. I had almost forgotten her, as she was in the Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday sequence classes--the deadliest on the schedule. She told me how this one class helped her through her entire college life. She was a journalism major. It made her studies in all other courses easier. More important, it helped her to feel more comfortable and at ease in social situations. I received a Christmas card recently from a former student located in Peru, South America, with this message, "Professor, you won't remember me, but I was a student in your Speech class. I want to wish you a Merry Christmas and tell you that you opened a window for me."

You as a speech teacher deal with human stuff. You have an overriding mission to nurture the growth and the flowering of the inner personality of your students.

## THE EMERGING CONCEPTS CONCERNING COMMUNICATION AS RELATED TO THE SPEECH ART

(Presented in Spring of 1965
at the University of Texas)

This second lecture has a title: "The Emerging Concepts Concerning Communication as Related to the Speech Art." I see by the morning paper that two Texas high schools met yesterday at 2:00 p.m. to play a scheduled game of baseball. The game, however, was called, not because of rain or darkness, but it was called because both teams traveled to the other's athletic field. Could something have gone wrong in communication?

When the Speech Association of America was founded a half-century ago, a special committee was formed to state the goals and objectives of the national order. One prime objective, the committee said, was to teach that speech should be a vehicle for the sincere communication of thought and feeling, as opposed to speech as an exhibition or performance. Thus, the concept of communication versus exhibition in public speech was stressed when our Association was born. During the past decade and a half new applications to speech have been developed. A fringe interrelated discipline has emerged in the areas of speech, journalism, English, anthropology, and radio-television departments across the nation. This movement was called "communication," whose universe is largely outside of public speaking--that is, public speaking performance, as such.

This has grown to sufficient proportions to engulf the old, established names and traditions which make up the speech field. Signs of this trend are noticeable on many fronts of our discipline. More and more speech texts use the word "communication" in their titles. Divisions and departments are being renamed. Witness my own university and the University of

Texas. Some schools are inaugurating Ph.D. programs in communication. The Speech Association of America, responding to the challenge of the times, is reappraising its rationale, and now is proposing to change its name from the Speech Association of America to the International Association of Arts and Sciences of Communication.

Communication is an interdisciplinary approach to human communication. This new concept is not to be confused with semantics or general semantics or any of the other social aspects that are pretty widely accepted by speech people. The franchise of communication may employ the learnings in speech, psychology, sociology, psychiatry, anthropology, philosophy, semantics, linguistics and other bodies of knowledge to measure, explain and predict matters of information and understanding exchanged between individuals and groups. David Berlo explains this communication movement using these words: "Essentially, it is concerned with the scope and purpose of communication, the factors involved in the process, and the role of language in human behavior. It is concerned about people's behavior and the relationship between the talker and the listener, the writer and the reader, the performer and the audience. It explores the complex nature of the communication process. It identifies and describes factors affecting communication and its results. It attempts an approach to the process that will increase understanding and effectiveness and yet avoid distortion or oversimplification."

In 1949, just sixteen years ago, the National Society for the Study of Communication was founded. One influential person, sometimes called the founder of the new society, was Elwood Murray, head of the Department of Speech at the University of Denver. Dr. Murray got his Ph.D. in psychology at the University of Iowa, and although he was a general semanticist, he was searching for academic manpower to uncover hidden information to help us know more about the causes of slippage, foul-ups, barriers and break-downs when people try to convey

information and meaning to one another. Murray's guiding hand is still felt in the communication movement.

In a larger and broader sense, communication is man's prime source of coping with his environment. I recall the popular writer of my college days, Henry Drummond, who defined death "as that state of the individual when it could no longer communicate with its environment." By implication, this definition may be turned towards life and living, and it would go like this. Man is alive in that measure by which he is able to communciate with the world about him.

The testimonies and pressures from business and industry have helped us, some of us at least, to crawl out of the ivory tower and to pay more attention to communication problems. We are constantly reminded of the fact that business and industry suffer an annual loss of some $10-20 billion dollars due to communication failures. Historians remind us that the outcome of many a battle from the time of Alexander the Great to Viet Nam turned on a single bit of communication. Even wars and the destiny of nations may hinge on a single phrase. Who can measure Churchill's "We shall never surrender." or General MacArthur's "I shall return." or Khrushchev's "We will bury you"? The Trojan horse type of communication bobs up again and again from the pages of history, but I'm always impressed with that one in the Bible: Result--"and the walls of Jericho came tumbling down."

The dramatic and galloping revolution since Pearl Harbor has greatly affected our communication problems to a point where man's survival on this planet is in great jeopardy. The volume of knowledgeable matter has more than doubled since Pearl Harbor, and much of this knowledge is in the area of science, machines, atomic energy, electronics, space exploration, and all of these involve capacities for self-extermination. Paradoxically, while the volume of knowledgeable matter increases, the area of ignorance for the average man becomes larger

and larger, and this throws his capacity for understanding and communication out of kilter. Thus, we're more and more called upon to do more and more blind flying.

I want to give attention to some emerging concepts related to communication and the speech act. I intend to gear this pretty largely to the speech teachers as they wrestle with problems in speech performance classes. The sub-channels and amplifiers of communication set off by speech are indeed many. By the same token, the barriers to communication which originate in speech are many. So we'll start off with the concept of speech as a two-way affair--the giver and the receiver, the speaker and the listener. Some standard concepts for evaluating the debate tournament have emerged, and most debate tournaments are judged by standard ballot. This has been more or less common practice for two decades or more. And to a degree, the pattern criteria for observing a speech as a creative piece has emerged. Most textbooks and teachers evaluate speech-making on the basis of these six dimensions: the speaker, the idea or substance, organization, language, delivery, and audience or occasion. There will some day emerge a similar pattern for appraising communicating speech. Will we look upon the speech performance as such as among the lesser factors when we evaluate the speech communication experience? Or, according to some speech-making criteria, you may have a lot of performers, but little communication, or vice versa, a lot of communication with very little performance. I suspect that a Socrates or an Abraham Lincoln or a Will Rogers or a Jesus Christ would probably have flunked many of our fundamental courses as they are regulated today.

I will identify five factors or channels which are germane to communication theory. Channel #1--we'll call this role to role, image to image, person to person, who to who. I refer to the speaker and the listener, and also to the listener to listener relationship. We are an image-conscious people, and this image

fetish has been well-spawned in our free and open society. The cult of personality which the Russians deplore, we embrace and magnify. Emerson's observation is part of our lingo, "What you are speaks so loudly I can't hear what you say." The Greeks gave much emphasis to the speaker ethos. We now call it ethical proof. Quintillian, perhaps the greatest speech teacher of all time, looked upon speech-making at its best as a good man speaking well. National commercial advertisements have become very sophisticated in the art of image-making. Nationally glorified heroes sell almost everything by their implied endorsements of life insurance, savings bonds, Bibles, soaps, toilet tissue and liver pills. Even major national political campaigns are more image than issue bound. Whiskers turned the tide of history when Woodrow Wilson and Charles Evan Hughes ran for president. It can truly be said that Wilson won that close race by a whisker. T.V. exaggerated this cult of image-making in the first of the debates between Nixon and Kennedy. Nixon was handicapped, not by the issues or by debating ability, as he is a very skilled debater, but by his face: Photogenically, there was an illusion of an unshaven thug. Of course, a little make-up took care of this handicap in future debates.

The three basic and key ingredients for high level prestige in the mind of the listeners are: 1) to like the speaker; 2) to trust the speaker; 3) to respect the speaker. In the Eisenhower campaigns, the genial general held a trump card--the slogan, "I like Ike." Trust and respect were secondary. When Harry Truman surprised the country by defeating Dewey, Truman's trump card was respect. Few liked him or trusted him, but people respected him. In the Goldwater-Johnson fracas, there were other complicated dimensions to consider, and in fact there was much real image prestige that stood out on either side of the fence. Perhaps, however, by default, the trigger-happy image had such a negative effect that the trust ingredient was badly shattered for the Arizona senator.

The prevading image of "look who's talking" weighs heavily upon the communication impact. Even children are quick to ask, "Who said that?--Did Mom say that? Or did Dad say that?" And it usually makes a whale of a difference. The elements that compose speaker image are almost countless, and they're very complex. We're familiar with many of them--position, rank, age, achievement, race, sex, character, reputation, authority, dress, speaking skill, etc. and etc. These all come into the picture in creating the prestige image.

We have thus far considered only the "who" source in the oral communication act as applied to the speaker. This is only part of it, many times a minor part. Look, who's listening? Be it one or many, human interaction now becomes much more complex since listeners, when in a group, react upon one another in a kind of a social, spiritual type of chemistry. Hidden catalysts are at work. Every listener resides in his private domain structured by his social self. But he is not isolated as a hermit would be; he is sensitive to persons to the left of him, to the right of him, and even those in the outer fringes of the listening group. Everyone is aware, to a degree, who is at the party. This may create heavy static on the "who" channel. Every social self reacts to age, sex, social status, education, taste, hostility or friendly attitude towards persons and their beliefs. The listeners, thus like so many amoebas, withdraw or reach out to one another as if to protect or to satisfy a social self.

Every speech teacher knows how the listening mood of a class is governed to a degree by who sits with whom and by who shares with whom the ideas and feelings expressed by the speaker. This class mood, be it weak or strong, is influenced by age, sex, race, campus idols, football heroes, foreign students, married people, bearded beatniks and budding Zsa Zsa Gabors. Even bare feet and shorts give static to this channel of communication. We cannot escape the person image. It is always in the state of flux; it is never static. The image statue of both teacher and students as

speakers and listeners will fluctuate widely from time to time throughout the course. In the back hill country, everyone is a friend or a foe. A stranger is a foreigner and hence he is a foe. Old Cy Perkins says he doesn't like that man. When asked, "Why?" old Cy merely grunts and says, "Oh, I don't know him."

The clue to what knowing a man may do to clear the channel of communication may be found in a Bible verse, Exodus 33:17: "And the Lord said unto Moses, I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken, for thou has found grace in my sight, and I know thee by name." Getting to know you helps to clear out the static in this channel of communication.

Now we take Channel #2, the second channel. This concerns thought to thought, attitude to attitude, belief to belief, prejudice to prejudice. I confess that I experienced some difficulty in my teenage days on a Nebraska farm in this hide-bound, fundamentalistic German Methodist community. Were I to think longingly of a fair maiden, I knew that she must meet triple requirements: she must be German; she must be a Methodist; and she must be a Republican. This explains why I left home the night of my graduation from high school. Sharp conflicts in beliefs, opinions, even taste, may interfere with clear, open-minded listening between people. Pride is often at stake when personal prejudices come into play. Too much pride can blind one's eyes from to is true, and hurt feelings beget hurt feelings. So this objective--calm, cool reasoning--is pretty much beyond the ability of both speaker and listener. The immature mind is quick to draw lines, and most of our minds are to some degree immature. The business becomes who is right and who is wrong, not what is probably true or false or what is probably wise or desirable.

Ideas have a hard time standing on their intrinsic merit. We are blessed or cursed with mental and emotional sets, with closed minds on such matters as religion, race, politics, personal ethics and morality. These are the

sources of much of the world's disharmony, discomfort and conflict. True tolerance and open-mindedness and a sincere, honest devotion to human dignity and all of its ramifications represent levels of social refinement and standards of the mature mind that few can attain even in an entire lifetime. And most of us, at one time or another, inwardly say, "To hell with the Ten Commandments"--at least, to hell with some of them.

Of course, we will always stand up in our righteous dignity to speak and act in accord with our educated conscience. There is a divine authority that comes from your mother's knee, and it may be violently in conflict with the divine authority which came from my mother's knee. Ah, there is the rub. We don't have the same mother. What I know in my heart to be right may be very different from what you know in your heart to be right. And wasn't there some language of the heart for Joan of Arc? Or John Brown? Or Aaron Burr? Or Governor Wallace? Or Dr. Martin Luther King? Or the Buddhist monk that dies by fire? Or the Indian woman who sacrifices her baby in the River Ganges to appease the Gods? Thus, closed minds, fixed attitudes and frozen prejudices may be more than barriers; they may be solid blocks in this channel of communication. It may be agonizing for most of us to ponder the thought that we came to see and hear those things in the world, not as they really are, but as we are.

Now the third channel concerns the environment or circumstance. Where and when does the speech act occur? What are the immediate physical conditions? The communication impact will always be influenced by the time of the day, the room, the temperature, the weather, the season, the humidity and so on. Where and when speaking and listening take place makes a difference. Shakespeare, of course, knew this; he knew how to create atmosphere to get the communication impact he wanted. Note the opening scene in the play, Hamlet. It is near midnight. In the darkness on the platform the sentries are walking back and forth, and one

sentry says, "The air bites shrewdly. It is an eager and nipping air." This, of course, is a proper environment that is created for Hamlet's ghost to appear. What a difference in mood and meaning of words spoken in church, as compared to the cocktail lounge, the dinner table and the parlor, the bedroom and the kitchen, the principal's office and the dance floor. Every speech class is influenced by the size and the shape of the room, the furnishings, the lighting, the ventilation, the time of day, the closeness to a holiday, the closeness to a vacation, a big party, an important examination, a crucial football game, an ice storm, or the assassination of a president.

The fourth channel of communication involves the manipulation and the handling of the signals and symbols of meaning. This is language and delivery. Ah, here's where we speech teachers feel at home. Perhaps the most obvious thing that sticks out in the speaking process is language and delivery. One word, one glaring grammatical error, one mispronounced word can jam this communication channel. Yet words and delivery may be sharp tools to reinforce, to color, and to dramatize thought and feeling. Generally, language is among the most neglected dimensions in the speech classroom, and delivery is downgraded. Words may hide meaning as well as reveal meaning. Note this quote from a speaker: "It is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to speak on a subject of such great importance. As I ponder this question I am filled with inspiration. I sincerely hope that you who cherish liberty and freedom will exercise your God-given rights and rally to this noble cause and find a solution--a solution which will assure peace and honor. Seldom in the course of human affairs have we faced so great a responsibility. Seldom have we had a more glorious opportunity to stand up for what is right. I'm sure you'll reap the rewards of happiness as you carry out your individual duty in this worthy endeavor. May the light of truth guide your conscience. And may I say again, it is the past that lies behind us. It

is the present that is here with us now. And it is the future that lies before us."

Nothing but words, words, words. But if I say, "Joe, your shirt is dirty," there is some kind of a communication impact. Yet this is somewhat hazy. Who is Joe? There are several Joes around. How dirty is dirty? Words are often fickle. Their meanings change. Brother was once an ennobling term, but if you say, "Big brother is watching you," it doesn't sound so good. Ladies' drawers became step-ins, and then teddy bears and then lingerie. Saloons have become cocktail lounges. Armies do not conquer a country, they liberate it. College professors don't get fired any more; they're given a leave. Janitors have become custodians; garbage collectors have become sanitary engineers; and the poor are underprivileged. Words are not always reliable. One word may have a dozen meanings. Johnny eats up his food and drinks down all his milk. You shout "look out" to your companion in the car, yet this is what he's been doing all the time.

Words may be charged with tyrannical power. There are samples: communist, fascist, socialism, extremist, crook, slut, bastard, nigger, scab, liar, etc. Delivery can often offer a great leverage in the communication process. When Khrushchev took off his shoe to stress his points for the assembly of the United Nations, it apparently was much more impressive than when he gave the speech in calmer times months later. It was said that Eleanor Duse could make a banquet audience cry just by reciting the alphabet.

Now I come to the final channel, #5, which I call self-equilibrium or inner balance--the feeling of at-homeness. We often hear the expression, "He is his own worst enemy." This, in a measure, may be applied to almost everyone, at least part of the time. We carry a number of cells within us. And they don't always get along well with each other. Karl Menninger wrote a book a decade ago called, Man Against Himself. We needn't look far to see proof of this, for man overeats, he overworks,

he overbuys, he overdrinks, he overgambles, he overindulges in the flesh, he hurts the people he loves most, he tries to become noble, then hates a part of himself and becomes entangled in feelings of guilt, and develops a conscience which makes sort of a coward out of him. A line in Hamlet's soliloquy points up the meaning here when he says, "Thus, conscience makes cowards of us all."

Those quiet complexes among communication may cause static where ideas are exchanged orally. Eric Fromm says, "In life situations, anyone who judges a person solely by what he says is hopeless." If we confine our judgments to the outward manifestations of a speech as a rhetorical achievement or a performance as such, we may fail sadly to come to grips with the deeper realities of the communication phenomenon. Whether we speak or listen, the chances are that only a small part of us is operative as a communicative creature.

TEN GUIDELINES FOR THE SPEECH MAKER

(1) ATTITUDE in large print is the name of the game. How do you feel about the subject, time, place, and reason for your speech? Above all, how do you feel about yourself?

(2) Lest we forget, NO SPEECH IS PERFECT. There is always room for growth and improvement. A tree that stops growing is dead at the top.

(3) DON'T BE A COPY CAT. Do it your way. You have the brains, experience, and talent owned by no one else in the world. You and your speech are originals.

(4) Your speech is not like eating an apple--where, after the last bite, the job is finished forever. Your speech has the potential TO LINGER IN SOME MINDS FOR A LIFETIME.

(5) BE YOUR OWN CRITIC AND TEACHER. You know more about yourself than anyone else. It is easier to listen to your inner self than to some outsider.

(6) Do a little free lance browsing to OBSERVE HOW OTHER SPEAKERS DO THEIR JOBS. Gather some hints on how to improve your speaking by noting their strengths and weaknesses.

(7) Remember, a speech is not just an essay on its hind legs. It is a one-time, face-to-face interview. USE TONGUE-BORN RATHER THAN PEN-BORN LANGUAGE.

(8) KEEP YOUR COOL. Beware of verbal violence. Try to think without emotional confusion. Anger sparked by a hidden ego is a danger trap.

(9) DON'T BE A SHOW-OFF. Avoid being seen as a smart aleck. This can weaken what you say. Try to be a humble and modest person. This can work miracles by opening the windows of what is noble, wise, true, just--and by creating good will.

(10) NEVER BE A QUITTER. Never close the door on yourself. You may lock yourself out forever.

HARD-CORE DIMENSIONS OF SPEECH MAKING

All these factors of speech communication are strongly interlocked. Their relative importance may vary greatly moment by moment and from episode to episode--but all are forever present.

WHAT is said. This relates to message, ideas--the quality of substance offered to the mind of the listener. The product stands as the central element in sharing and spreading thoughts and feelings.

WHO says it. The image of the speaker can make or break the speech. "Who" says it may add to or detract from the quality of "what" is said.

HOW it is said. Language and delivery are the keys to the total speaking performance. Elements of the creative arts come into play. The final result is a combination of know-how, experience, and practice.

The SITUATION. When, why, and where does all this take place? Every occasion is a unique setting which governs not only what is said--but also how and why. The speaker must take complete charge of this moment of REALITY if opporunity and responsibility are to be transformed into "Mission Accomplished."

# AN OVERVIEW OF BEHAVIORAL MANIFESTATIONS OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION DURING A LIFESPAN

(Presentation at the Speech Communication Association Convention, December 1965)

I am supposed to say something in six minutes that was in the making for more than 60 years. Our energetic and able chairman, Dr. Dance, wisely admonished me to go easy on philosophizing and pay strict attention to honest, factual reporting geared to personal testimony. With these ground rules before me, I soon discovered that a central message or single thesis would not emerge. I, therefore, have chosen to identify a few impressions growing out of my personal observations of communication behavior across the years, especially the later ones.

Impression Number (1): During my retirement year and since that time, I have noticed a sharp change in the listening attitude among my students and colleagues, especially when I did the talking. Now I am suddenly surrounded by the most attentive, respectful, and courteous listeners. This, for me, was a new experience, and I found it a bit frustrating, a little fearsome but, I admit, most exhilarating. Had I known this was going to happen, I would have started preparing for this day a decade ago. I could have improved the quality of what I had to say

Impression Number (2): I found in my later years that I could afford and enjoy a unique luxury which often was denied me during my struggling years. I can now afford the luxury of integrity. Having a sense of security, I can be honest in committee meetings, seminar sessions, and conferences. I have no fears of being fired or demoted or kicked upstairs, or of having a petition denied. Honesty that

grows out of the bulwark of security is a rare and precious commodity.

Impression Number (3): I am growing more and more sensitive, more closed-minded, and perhaps a bit cantankerous about the intimate, menial, and personal things close by in day-to-day living. It matters more now how the toast is prepared for breakfast, how comfortable my pajamas are, and how I wind the cuckoo clock. I am growing to become more like an old house dog who finds the blessings of ease and comfort in direct ratio to his well-established habits.

It is interesting to note, however, while I care more about little things close by that I can feel, taste, hear, and smell, I have developed reverse attitudes about some sore spots and controversial matters far removed from my doorstep. I couldn't care less what happens to Richard Burton and Liz Taylor, or Bobby Baker, or the Beatles, or the New York Yankees. Even student riots stir me less than the migration of wild geese. Yet the day was when I would have ranted and raved about such things.

Impression Number (4): New experiences and new challenges grow out of one's ability to live with oneself. Ours is the discipline devoted to the problems of communicating with one another through speech. We have failed, however, in our studies and searches to teach an individual how to communicate with himself. I have found very little in our profession that will discipline an old man in the art of keeping company with himself. This need becomes more acute as one's physical self slows down and the mental self remains energetic, robust, and often turbulent. Now I find myself surrounded by all kinds of stuff out of which ideas can be conceived, born, and nurtured. I am endowed with the richest storehouse of knowledge and experience I have ever had. Ironically, this happens at a moment when listeners are fewer and I am left to visit more with myself. This is, in many ways, a new

experience, but fortunately it can be made into a jolly and rewarding one. There is much to talk and visit about, and you have, as Wendell Johnson pointed out, sitting beside you, "your most enchanted listener." You have the floor, and you can keep it as long as you want it. You have the advantage of vast materials to fortify you. There are endless files of facts, events, and personal experiences upon which you can draw. At last you can, if you wish, dive headlong into the hottest controversial matters and play the role of judge, jury, prosecutor, or defendant. This I have done on occasion and was amazed at my ability to be impartial and objective as I rotated from one role to another. This can be glorious fun. With a little patience and practice, you can have for yourself some show, the do-it-yourself kind. Oddly enough, bits of truth may shine forth from such a performance, at least the kind of truth you can use.

Impression Number (5): As I grow older I tend to place less reliance upon what people say as a true guide for the meaning they intend to convey. Language as a communication tool is shorn of much of its former authority. This attitude is not due to aging as much as to the rapid and drastic changes about us, especially those changes peculiar to American society.

Henry Drummond, a popular writer before the turn of the century, once defined death as "that condition of the body when it can no longer communicate with its environment." Using this premise, we might draw the inference that man comes alive in that measure by which he is able to communicate with the world about him. But, alas, this deduction suffers loss of much of its truth in a world where there is too much environment, much of which breeds static and interference among those communication channels where people talk to each other. The rub is that there is too much of the world, and the world is too much with us. We are bound by time schedules, places and things.

There is too much to know. The volume of knowledgeable matter is so vast that the area of ignorance becomes correspondingly vast for both speaker and listener. There are too many devices and gimmicks for communication. We are bombarded by words from every direction. And there is much congestion among sound waves, ether waves, and microwaves. Science has compressed time and space to a point where communication stumbles over its own feet, gets into its own way. Thus, a world has been created most unsuited for solitude and meditation. The term "know thyself" takes on a hollow meaning. Our people are crowded in cities jammed with communication media. Out of all these complexities of human contacts there is born a kind of bitter and painful loneliness of the inner self. One is hard put to scale these walls of confinement to find tranquility for one's soul, to find a spot of retreat to the mountain side or open field to replenish one's soul or rediscover it in the manner of John the Baptist. One wonders what the communication impact upon the country would be if our Constitution was born in 1965. Its authority today lies in its history and in its heritage, not in the raw worth of its language.

The complexities and demands upon the modern American man are such as to cause us to wonder what chance the Bible would have as a communication force if it were to appear on our shores, produced by the minds and pens of our own countrymen.

In the beginning was the Word; yes, but in the end, as of now, communication is much more than the word. There you have it, a very brief testimonial reflecting some of my impressions about speech communication related to behavioral manifestation.

SPEECH COMMUNICATION AND MODERN MAN

OR COURSE #145 AND "YOU"

(Opening lecture for the 145 courses at the University of Hawaii during the Spring semester of 1967)

When Col. Dyer commissioned me that afternoon in October to make this opening speech, I felt very flattered and honored. In fact for about 30 minutes, I was pretty cocky about it. But pride cometh before the fall and, by bedtime, I was cut down to size. As the days, weeks, and even months went by, the feeling of humility became stronger and more real. And now I stand before you as your servant with a humble and contrite heart, hoping I might say something to help you get off on the right foot in this course.

Before we get down to business, I would like to make a quick survey about how you feel toward this course. So please indicate by raising you hands on the following questions: First--How many of you are bothered by stage fright? Second--How many of you have a natural dread of making a speech before an audience? Third--how many of you would not have taken this course if it were not required?

I see I have a captive audience. Not since I last spoke to the prisoners in the federal penitentiary in Leavenworth, Kansas, have I faced such a large group of captive listeners. So come with me for the next 30 minutes or so and together we will snoop around the place, in search of some possible door or window for escape that will lead to your freedom and liberation.

Suppose we start off with a few concepts that have a philosophical basis. Take a brief look at man, that favorite child of the universe. He is lord and master over all living creatures. Indeed he is the masterpiece of

the creative process. He has been able to succeed where animals failed. He has been able to survive. The dinosaurs and hundreds of species of animals are not with us anymore. Man has two great advantages over all living creatures: intelligence and a miraculous communication device, the gift of speech.

Henry Drummond once defined death in this manner--"Death," he said "is that state of the body when it can no longer communicate with its environment." If we turn this logic the other way around, we might reason that man comes alive in that measure by which he is able to communicate with the world about him. Among all the communication mediums known to man, the gift of speech is supreme. Yet most of us take this gift for granted like the size of our feet or the color of our eyes. We have talked all of our lives. Like eating or walking, it seems a natural part of living. You may say that if speech is so common, why make such a big fuss about it? At times, it is as common as the air we breathe, but selective words for special purposes bring forth hidden power. "A drop of ink may make a million think," says the poet. A knife is a common tool useful for cutting meat or paper dolls, but a special knife in the hands of a skilled brain surgeon becomes a miracle instrument for the preservation of human life. We study and learn about speech as a special tool for special purposes at a special time to create a better life and a better world. The very fabric of society has been fashioned by the spoken word. Speech stands as man's crowning glory.

Ponder for a moment. Some of the samples of your heritage are born and nurtured by the spoken word. I will point out a few cases.

Exhibit A--Your Church: The next time you hear a church bell or see its steeple, pause a moment and bear in mind that nearly 2000 years ago there lived a man by the Sea of Galilee. This man, measured by our standards, lived a very simple life. He never raised a family, never wrote a book, never went to college; although he was a carpenter, he never carried a

union card. But he was articulate about a way of life, and preached the world's most unforgettable sermons without chancel, pulpit or notes. He organized by word-of-mouth a committee of simple men--fishermen and tradesmen--and taught them how to spread the good news of God's love for man. That Christian faith was spread over half of the globe by preaching and personal testimony. That faith is deeply engrained in the life and culture of these islands. The command was "Preach the Gospel," not write it.

Exhibit B--Your Flag: YOU, who belong to the youngest state of the the Union; YOU, who are proud of your newly won citizenship of the U.S.A., remember that less than three life spans ago, 55 men met in assembly in Philadelphia, in the stifling heat of the summer, to hammer out by talk a design for a new national government. This they did and it was the marvel of the age. The English statesman, Gladstone, called it "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the pen and purpose of man."

Exhibit C--Your School: Most of you during the past ten or twelve years have spent more of your waking hours in a school room than in your home. Now, you continue your education at the university level. But real education involves more than just books and buildings. Next time you step into your library--which, incidentally is the heart of the University--remember, you are standing in the midst of the sacred monument of the spoken word. The endless stacks of books that surround you represent the storehouse of the written world. But without language and speech, there would be no library, no little red school house, no university.

Some 3,000 years ago by the blue Mediterranean, there lived a handful of people who gathered in groups in search of beauty, truth, justice and wisdom. These humble people, by the majesty of their minds and the gift of speech, studied geography without books--YES, they studied public speaking without a syllabus or a mimeographing machine.

Yet these people created a culture so rich, so enduring, and worked out a design for living so plausible that if you gutted the University of Hawaii of the total contribution of the ancient Greeks, the whole fabric of the College of Liberal Arts would fall apart. The Greeks verbalized their ideas.

I bring you this sketchy historical picture as related to your church, your flag, and your school, as a bit of eloquent testimony to show that man is forever shaping his destiny with his tongue.

I realize that in this modern world of gadgets, gimmicks, and machines, of moon rockets and wonder drugs, all this historical stuff about speech and society may not reach you--may leave you cold and untouched. So let's take a closer, more realistic look at speech as it concerns you and the fundamental nature of modern man. What are some of the deeper concerns of speech communication as it relates to you, your life, and your way of living?

First, and perhaps most obvious, is the fact that speech is a practical, functional, tool for living and making a living. In any given day, you may speak 15,000 to 20,000 words and listen to twice that many. We use speech to make love, raise our families, educate our children, carry on commerce, govern ourselves, and pray to our God. Those who talk well seem to get the better jobs, make the most sales, get more votes, gain more social status, than those who speak poorly. The crucial fact is, one must be articulate in a free and open society to reap the rewards of the abundant life. Strong as this functional argument may sound to you, it alone and by itself does not give us much of a philosophical basis for a required course in the College of Liberal Arts. This would put us in the class with trade schools and on a par with the courses in cooking and auto mechanics.

We must look closer and deeper to the fundamental nature of man. Man is a social animal. No man lives on an island. Speech is

man's chief bulwark against loneliness. It feeds his social hungers, gives him a sense of belonging. Thus we look upon solitary confinement as being among the most cruel forms of punishment and torture.

One of the richest rewards emerging from man's gift of speech lies in its power to energize and spread ideas. An idea is still the force that moves the mountain. Man has literally split the atom with his tongue. Applied knowledge brought us the telephone, the automobile, the radio, television, the moving picture, the airplane, radar, electronics, computerized science, the moon rockets all in my lifetime. The output of new knowledge has more than doubled since you were in the second grade. Knowledge is that kind of stuff that feeds on itself. Like money, it grows in a ratio to its circulation and use. "Knowledge is power," said Sir Francis Bacon. But knowledge locked in the head and never shared or expressed is as worthless as the grains of sand in the Sahara Desert.

Speech is a way of thinking. Speaking and thinking are as inseparable as Siamese twins. Each may control the other interchangeably. Language and speech enable the restless and turbulent mind to take off in any direction at any time. This gives man not only the means for thinking, but gives him a private room to visit with himself and become involved in a most exciting and creative dialogue. Here he can do his mental stretching exercises and hone his mind to a sharp cutting edge. In this gymnasium of inner speech, genius is born--a Socrates, a Shakespeare, an Einstein, a Churchill.

Speech is both a reflector and a creative agent of the human personality. It is the measure of the man. Others are quick to size us up by the way we talk. We meet a stranger and one word from his lips gives the clue whether he is a gentleman or a bum. "By their speech ye shall know them," is a matter of Scripture. When we talk, we radiate a thousand

clues for better or worse by which others form opinions of us.

On the more positive side, guided speaking experience before a group will help draw out your better nature and tap your personal resources. It is a thrilling, exhilarating experience to talk about something you know about and about which you have strong feelings or beliefs.

Throw your manuscript away, and throw yourself into your speech. Push the podium aside--perhaps have a few skimpy notes--but grab facts and ideas by the nape of the neck and drop them into the mental laps of your consumers. Feel their reaction and respond to it. Wrap yourself around whatever you have to say. This can be a great venture in self-awakening and self-discovery. Speaking before your class can serve as a catalyst for generating creative powers of your mind and contribute importantly to the growth and flowering of your personality.

"Know thyself" is a classic slogan of the ancient Greeks. But you must first find yourself, and a speech class is a good place for this kind of search. Fellow students--I speak on this point with deep feeling. For here I stand as living testimony as one who was born again in speech classes at Northwestern University more than four decades ago. I owe my presence at the University of Hawaii and my presence on this platform and much of my professional life and personal happiness to the experience of self-renewal which came to me in speech classes.

Now my fellow captives, methinks I see a light from yonder window; and, if I read that message from that light correctly, it says "the ability to be articulate is essential to inner harmony and emotional balance. He who can express himself is free; he who can't is walled-in with part of himself in a cell of solitary confinement." Students, if you thirst for freedom on the sea of higher learning, in the

classical phrase of Booker T. Washington, "cast down your buckets where you are."

Out of this background concerning the nature of speech and modern man, the goals of this course emerge. I am in substantial agreement with the goals mentioned in your syllabus. I merely reshuffle them to gain another perspective. They are:

(1) To help you become a more effective speaker and listener; our concern is to improve your ability in the mastery of speaking and listening skills.

(2) To give you knowledge and insights of the basic theories and principles which govern the oral communication process. In other words, our concern is to give you a better understanding of what makes the wheels go round when you make a speech.

(3) To enlarge and enrich your general background of knowledge and information. A speech class is a special, unique, academic club devoted to the search and communication of worthwhile ideas. Both students and teachers are commissioned to advance each other's general education.

(4) To help you towards self-adjustment and to give you a stronger sense of personal equilibrium which grows from increased poise and confidence.

(5) To improve your capacity for critical thinking so you may better discern the truth in the light of cogent logic.

No, my fellow students, this course is not something that has been dreamed up by college deans and professors just to make life miserable for you. It is not enough that the college graduate be equipped with knowledge and the milk of human kindness. He must also be a rational, articulate, and responsible citizen of his community, be it local, national, or world-wide. In this complex world, with its booby traps that can break the human spirit,

man has his best chance to survive and feel at home with himself and his habitat if he has good command of the spoken word.

**********

So much for the first part of our visit. Now for the second part. We now come face-to-face with that common problem known as a "bugaboo"--a kind of an affliction, which is in a way contagious, can't be quarantined, can't be absolutely cured. But it can be brought under control and put to good use. What is this strange thing that grabs you by your emotional interior when you make a speech? Yes, you guessed it. It is stage fright. The opposite of stage fright is poise and confidence. We know stage fight largely by its symptoms--the pounding heart, the flushed face, cold sweat, trembling limbs, dry mouth, loss of memory, sinking feeling in the stomach--and so on.

How do we get this way? Stage fright is generated in various ways. Usually there is no single, simple isolated cause that you can yank out like a weed in the garden to totally get rid of the problem. There are patterns and species of stage fright depending on their sources. The brand perhaps most common is the "ego" involvement type. Your exalted sense of self-importance is at stake. You're status bound. Your sense of pride has been invested. You care. In fact, you care too much what others think of you. You worry about others seeing your deficiencies and imperfections, imaginary or real. Hence you feel "self-conscious." Your conscious self then becomes an impostor and pushes your real self out of the way. And listeners are introduced to a synthetic self that is unreal, and they are denied the true image of the real YOU.

Another species of stage fright arises out of conflict. Conflict exists when thoughts and feelings are drawn in opposite directions. Examples of conflict in life are endless--the first time you drive a car, your first date,

the first time you take an important examination. You have mixed feelings of possible success or failure. The farmer's daughter, who was asked to sing the solo part in the church choir due to the sudden illness of the regular soloist, is at first thrilled and flattered. However, after the first flush of inner joy subsides, she is seized by a sense of fright. She says to herself, "Oh, dear, what if I should fail." Sweet thoughts of triumph conflict sharply with bitter thoughts of failure. The strong desire to do and the fear of failure work against each other so strongly that the will to action approaches dead center. When thoughts of personal glory conflict with fear of failure, a good state of stage fright can develop.

Many little conflicts may bob up when you make your speeches: What to talk about. How to prepare. What facts or illustrations to use or omit. What impression you will make upon the class, the teacher. What kind of grade you will make. When conflicts pile up, inhibitions build up, which undermine self-confidence.

Another species of stage fright is characterized by a feeling of dread or aversion to making speeches. Perhaps you are timid, shy, reticent. . .You tend to withdraw from others. Group attention is distasteful, and you have no desire to be in the limelight.

Still another species of stage fright is of the synthetic or concocted type. It is a product of imagination and foolish notions. What monstrosities people create by their imagination! Like Don Quixote they look for and find windmills to fight. They imagine the audience to be larger than it is; they imagine listeners to be hostile when they are friendly; they fear that the Day of Judgment will descend on the earth should there be a slip of the tongue. They even develop emotional allergies. They feel scared at the sight of a podium, a raised platform, a microphone. The very word public speaking gives them a cold chill.

Some even embrace the misery of stage fright. Thus, they become hypochondriacs and pose as victims of this malady so they can tell others about it and, in this way, feed another side of their ego. Stage fright, thus, becomes a source of gratification and serves as a crutch to lean upon.

Among this group of synthetic fears are those who are afraid of being afraid. An emotion transfers itself to another position, like falling in love with love. Franklin Roosevelt once reminded us that the greatest thing to fear is fear itself.

Finally, there are those fears that grow out of the unknown--this is something like being afraid of the dark. We don't know what dangers lurk in the dark corners of an audience. We are unsure of what to expect. The strange and unfamiliar brings on that nervous and uneasy feeling.

Fortunately, there is that large class of students, who though inexperienced, have that healthy, normal attitude toward making a speech. They take their tensions in stride and patiently learn how best to live with them, manage or control them, and put them to good use. They know they can speak well enough without feeling completely at ease.

Why be concerned about it? I will mention three reasons.

(1) Self-confidence governs in a large measure the way the whole speaking process works. It influences your thinking, your attitude toward yourself, your subject, your purpose, your audience. It affects your memory, your choice of words, your voice, and your gestures.

(2) A student in the grip of stage fright is in no condition to benefit much from the criticisms of his teacher. One must be all there with all his speaking faculties in good order before he can hope to make much progress in the course.

(3) Poise and confidence help create the speaker's image. The personality that is eroded by fear does not carry the "authentic" sign. Your text makes much of the fact that a major source of proof lies in the speaker himself. This source largely goes for naught unless the speaker has control of himself.

What to do about it? First, start off by developing a sound, sensible perspective of the problem. Get a good understanding of the nature and the role of the tensions related to the phenomenon of speech fright. Build self-confidence by developing constructive attitudes.

(1) Stage fright is common to the human species. Man by nature is a social creature. He wants to belong and to be accepted by his peers. In a free, competitive society, the drive for status is exaggerated. Stage fright is not a "bothersome thing" reserved for the few. Others are in the same fix, and the fellow next to you probably is worse off than you. So don't think you are peculiar. You are perfectly normal. Great speakers are not immune. Demosthenes at one time was so disheartened that he forsook the assembly. Cicero said of himself, "I turn pale at the outset of each speech and quake in every limb and all my soul." Even such famous speakers as Daniel Webster, Mark Twain, William Jennings Bryan, Will Rogers, and Winston Churchill complained about stage fright.

(2) The problem is yours and yours alone. It is completely and unequivocably "you" centered. Like your fingerprints, it is peculiarly yours. You have the sole copyright to your own special brand of stage fright, and you are the only person in all the world who must cope with it. Fortunately there is a doctor in the house, but only one--who can help you--it is "you."

As a doctor, you must diagnose and prescribe. Obviously, pills and surgery are out. You might first check on the kind of person you are. Are you the regressive type? The

introvert, shy, timid, reticent? Do you tend to live too much within yourself, withdrawn from others? If so, it is the prime cause for your aversion to speech-making? Or are you predominately the outgoing type of person, the decided extrovert? Do you yearn for attention? Are you a kind of compulsive "ham" always ready to get into the act?

What about the conditioning factors--some that may go way back into your early childhood? Did you always feel secure and happy in your home? Was a parent, brother or sister domineering over you? Always belittling you? Do you recall any unpleasant embarrassing experiences associated with church or school programs or class exercises in which you took part? Psychological childhood wounds are often slow to heal.

May your self-consciousness be connected with your sex? Physical appearance? Size, shape, weight, color of skin, or health limitations? Are you sensitive because your ears weren't pierced? Are you sensitive about your educational background, the kinds of grades you make, your socio-economic status, your identification with a minority group, your set beliefs in matters of religion, politics, interracial problems, or personal morality? Is your frustration brought on because you tend to fret and worry? Are you particularly sensitive about some technical phase of speaking such as language, vocabulary, pronunciation, diction, or delivery?

Do you tend to underrate yourself or the worthiness of your personal resources? Are your self-demands realistic and reasonable? Or do you insist upon shooting at the moon, knowing full well that you will fail and still have the jitters.

(3) Remember that stage fright is more of an asset than a liability, more of a blessing than a curse. The bad side of the phenomenon gets all the publicity, its virtues get very little notice. Acknowledge the fact that nature provides a built-in protective device to

contain and preserve the whole man and give order to his whole personality. Hence, it isn't something to get rid of, like a wart on your toe. It is something to live with, something to control, something to put to good use. Nature gives you a "supercharger," an extra supply of power and energy. Harness and control this added supply of strength, and stage fright becomes a most rewarding asset in your speaking venture.

(4) Control comes gradually. It cannot be accomplished overnight. It is not like turning on a switch. You are always at a point of no return--like the airplane pilot who experiences a near-miss fatal crash, and who must get back into the cockpit at the first opportunity or he will never fly again. Never call it quits.

(5) It is best that you compete with yourself instead of for grades or against certain members of the class. What matters most is how well you make use of your resources and your abilities. Have you been true to the talents available to you? Not all pebbles on the beach are the same size, shape, or color. You may make your greatest progress toward self-mastery the day you make your poorest speech grade and the least progress the day you make your best speech grade.

(6) Remember the speaker stands at the safest place in the entire building. The speaker has every advantage. He is surrounded by friends and is nearest the exits. In case of fire, bombs, or bullets, in case there be snakes, tigers, or tidal wave, he is already on his feet ready to leap, duck or run for safety. If you think danger lurks around the platform, your imagination is playing tricks on you.

In addition to the attitudinal approach, there are specific steps you can take.

(1) Prepare your speeches. Know what you are going to say and keep the purpose well in mind.

(2) Accentuate the positive. Stand up and speak out in a full voice. Express yourself with more than normal vocal color and energy.

(3) Get your entire physical self into the game. Talk with your body. This helps break tensions and free the mind. Breathe deeply. Walk to the platform with long strides. Take a big drink of water. Use the blackboard, visual aids, and so on. Bodily action helps distribute the physical nervous energy. After the kickoff, the football players are at ease.

(4) Look sharp the day you speak. A little special grooming may help you feel more at ease.

(5) Talk to the friendly faces. Pay little attention to others.

(6) Keep your mind on what you are saying. Surrender as much as possible to the meaning of what you want to convey and the purpose of your speech.

(7) Stop running away. Welcome the audience as the would-be swimmer welcomes water. The novice swimmer must first know how to meet and challenge the water as a friendly force. He doesn't shrink from it. He moves towards it. Likewise, the would-be speaker must learn how to meet and challenge an audience as a friendly force.

Before we bring this visit to a close, a few words are in order about the nature and character of this course. This course is unique compared to most courses you take. What may work well for you in french or chemistry may not work here.

A speech class has a strong social orientation. In a sense, it is a newly-formed little community with common problems and interests which are met in close face-to-face relationships by both teacher and students. Human equations come into play in countless ways. Personalities rub off on one another. Students become aware of a pronounced classroom atmosphere, which often becomes a strong moti-

vating force for a stimulating speech performance of high quality. When the class group becomes highly polarized, it almost teaches itself.

The core activity is individual performance. Other classes may involve some kind of performance, but it is usually more limited and fragmentary. Speech-making is more of a total process involving the personality and character of the speaker, his beliefs, attitudes, tastes, judgments, creative imagination, language, delivery and more. Everyone in turn does his own show all by himself. What other course is so oriented?

Your individuality and sense of creativity are more precious assets in a speech class than in most other classes. Originality may not help much when it comes to translating a passage from German or working out an equation in algebra. In a speech class, there is always room for the inventive, creative mind. In fact, here is often the key to a student's total growth and progress.

There are few absolute or perfect scores in the usual sense, as one might find in mathematics, accounting or engineering. We deal mostly with probabilities, value judgments and relative truths. No speech is 100 percent perfect. There is always room for improvement.

Attitudes of dread and resentment towards the course place you in double jeopardy. You may do pretty well gradewise in some courses, no matter how much you dislike the pick and shovel work that is required. It is easier to dissect a frog, hating doing it, than to make an effective speech in a sullen frame of mind. The speaker who seems cheerful and enthusiastic always has the advantage over the one who reflects a hostile, disgruntled attitude.

You are not learning or mastering a brand new skill. You are searching for insights and abilities in the effective application of old familiar skills.

Self-generated motives are doubly rewarding to the speech student. He who competes with himself, instead of for grades, does his best work. What matters most is the testing out of one's maximum talents and resources.

Genuine effort, courteous manners, and show of interest bring greater rewards in a speech class than elsewhere.

I grant this speech was more of the persuasive type than expository. I planned it that way. For faith is of the essence. You will do better if you can operate from a position of faith--faith in yourself, faith in the course, faith in your teacher. So don't fight it. Speech communication is part of the law of human life, as is the law of gravity and the law of electricity in the physical world. Our central concern is the fruitful use of these laws of nature. Aloha! and Happy Sailing.

# I COME NOT TO BURY MY FRIEND

# BUT TO PRAISE HIM

(This article is part of a speech delivered at the Annual Convention of the Pacific Speech Association, January 28, 1967, and was printed in Pacific Speech, Vol. 1, No. 4.)

My friend Oratory is not dead. He has been stabbed, ridiculed, shot at, ostracized and betrayed. Even those who once glorified him have turned against him and are eager to preach his funeral sermon at an imaginary grave. But my friend is not dead. He is very much alive. Some who still embrace him the classroom seek to lock him out of the extra-curricular field. There are those who glory in his decline and call him by other names--"Public Address," "Persuasion," "Public Speaking." Some say he is a "Phoney"--a "Faker," a tool of the demagogue. They say his old power is gone, destroyed by the radio, by television, by ghost writers, by the god of science and the craze for interpersonal dialogue. All of this is poppycock. He is very much alive and he still wears that strange mantle of power which holds sway over the hearts and minds of men. In fact, he is more powerful than ever. He can talk to an audience ten times as large as the total number of people William Jennings Bryan could reach in 30 years speaking to packed houses everyday in the week.

Of course the image of Demosthenes standing in his robes by marble pillars is gone. The grandeur and majesty of Daniel Webster has faded from view, and the pipe organ voice of Bryan is seldom heard or needed in this modern day of voice amplification. But this does not mean Oratory is dead. Styles of oratory have been modified. Celluloid collars and high buttoned shoes are out of fashion, but clothing is still the order of the day--topless dresses, notwithstanding. Shakespeare isn't dead even

though his style of writing is out of date. The eternal truths which concern humanity, peace, justice and the arts of living can best be explored by good men who speak eloquently.

Not in the more than 3,000 years since the time of ancient Greece and Rome has one single nation been so richly endowed with the products of oratory as has the United States. Even if my friend should fall asleep for a generation or more, like Rip Van Winkle, and if we keep our academic freedom, he still would live a 1,000 years--so rich is his legacy.

The faith and feeling of every schoolboy has been touched by such history-making phrases as, "I know not what course others may take but, as for me, give me liberty or give me death," or "Union now and forever one and inseparable," or "This nation cannot live half slave and half free."

No one knows to what degree the course of our national destiny may have been tilted one way or another by such oratorical expressions as: "Ye shall not crucify mankind on a cross of gold"; "Make the world safe for democracy"; "Back to normalcy"; "The greatest thing we have to fear is fear itself"; "Old soldiers never die, they just fade away"; "Ask not what your county can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

Beyond the public or secular role of oratory is the unique role which has special meaning for all of us as speech educators. Long before oratory found its way into our regular classrooms in either a practical or academic sense, it was very much alive outside of the classroom. Oratorical activities were prominent at the college chapel, class day exercises, commencement time and contest events. Intercollegiate forensics flourished on a wide scale almost two decades before the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking was founded. But college oratorical contests flourished even more brilliantly almost two decades before intercollegiate debating became established.

An oratorical contest was a highlight on any college calendar. In some colleges, ten percent of the student body went out for oratory. Railroads often ran special trains between cities and towns of competing schools. Victories were celebrated with bonfires, torchlight parades and blaring bands, climaxed by a rousing speech of congratulations by the college president. No modern football hero ever enjoyed greater glory or honor than the college orator of long ago.

In the days before the profession of speech teachers was established, the accomplishments of college orators and debaters made a favorable impression upon the college faculties. It was this image that did much to bring speech as an educational discipline to the regular college curriculum. No one knows how long the birth of our profession would have been delayed were it not for the good image created by intercollegiate forensics.

As tournament debating began to grow and spread in the thirties, college oratory began to decline. This decline became more pronounced in both quality and quantity following World War II. Oddly enough, however, interscholastic oratory among the high schools has held up remarkably well. Today, thanks to four national supporting organizations and state sponsored speech festivals, more than a half million high school boys and girls annually compete in contest oratory.

Although interest in competitive oratory has diminished markedly outside the college classroom, the roll of oratorical literature in various dimensions takes on new significance in the speech classrooms. Written samples and models for critical study and evaluation have entered the speech classrooms in a big way. A plethora of books, mostly paperbacks, featuring samples of speeches and orations have come on the market during the past decade. It is now common practice to use these books as supplementary source material in basic speech courses. This is what we do at the University of Hawaii. My friend is not dead; he is more

alive than ever teaching hundreds of thousands of college students the rudiments or oral suasion in the established courses of the curriculum.

In the firmament of speech education, the light of oratory shines beyond the competitive platform performances and critical evaluation practices in basic speech courses. It has been a major source of energy, life, and vitality among our programs of graduate studies. The great bulk of the pick and shovel work of graduate studies fall in the area of speech-rhetoric and oratory. More than 1,000 M.A. theses have been devoted to this area and more than 100 Ph.D. dissertations. This represents millions of hours of labor and study. Here lies the rich veins of solid materials, where the men who make up the hierarchy of our profession found their habitat and answered the challenge for scholarship and academic achievements. No, oratory is not dead. Here our profession found its manifest destiny, its reason for being.

Dr. T. V. Smith, Professor of Philosophy, University of Chicago, writing for the Quarterly Journal of Speech some two decades ago, observed that "Poetry is the servant of the lover--Prose is the servant of the scientist--Oratory is the servant of the statesman." The business of the statesman is to serve humanity. He may be found in places other than the White House or the political or the legislative forums of the nation. He may be found in the church pulpit and parlors, the civic clubs, the classroom. Flashes of oratorical eloquence may break out anywhere at any time when people talk about things they care about. From Moses to Dirksen, the world turns as men speak for special causes for special purposes, with special words in a special way. When my friend Oratory dies, Mankind will be in the grave by his side.

# STRUCTURING THE COMMUNICATION ACT

(Presented at the University of Nebraska, Fall 1968.)

## Part I

I have news for you. I shall not require speech outlines to be handed in to be graded. After more than 40 years as a classroom speech teacher this is the first time I have ever made such an announcement. My colleagues may shudder at this, but if this be treason make the most of it.

Some may say "et tu, Buehler, and you the disciple of Oratory and rhetoric?" Yes, I confess my deep and abiding faith in speech organization. That faith has never wavered. At one time I prepared 17 separate debate briefs on national high school and College debate topics for three different publishers. This was followed by writing four separate chapters on speech organization in four separate speech texts. I owe my professional life to rhetoricians from Aristotle to Olsen and Laase. Speech Communiation as an academic discipline in the U.S.A. rests firmly on the foundation of rhetoric. It is in the area of rhetoric where we find the hierarchy of our profession--the productive scholars, the builders of college speech departments, the writers and teachers.

I will try to develop various concepts concerning the role of organization in speech-making. In this process will emerge my rationale for not requiring written, teacher-graded outlines in this course. I want to make it clear however, that I do not mean to belittle the use of outlines or in any way detract from the importance of form and structure in the art and science of public oral discourse.

The message of form and order comes to us loud and clear in the opening passage of the Bible. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void." We get the message in the course of the stars, in the tiny wing of the insect, in every plant and living creature. We get it in all forms of art, poetry, painting, music, drama. We see it in government, church, business and inall institutions of man. We cannot escape it when making speeches.

Speech organization is a creative art. It has its roots in a pattern of both logic and imagination and emerges best by the integration of both. The creative act goes beyond the ordinary commonplace level of ideas, feelings and experiences to which we have become accustomed. When you assemble ideas for a speech and shuffle around things you want to say, you are creating. By connecting previously unrelated ideas, says Arthur Koestler, the speaker obtains "a higher level of mental evolution." He, in a sense, is liberating himself from rigidly-established habits by means of his originality. This gives the speaker a rewarding sense of accomplishment and a kind of inner feeling of being transcended to a new level of self-fulfillment. You will fare best at speech organization by confining your efforts to your own personal resources. Put the stamp of originality on the way you think, feel, reason, assemble your substance, and structure your message.

Organizing a speech is a highly individualistic and personalized undertaking. You must start from scratch everytime you make a speech. All kinds of variables confront you. Thus, creativity takes on an added premium value in light of the various constraints the speaker must face when organizing his speeches.

At the outset accept the fact that you alone are the sole author of your product. There are all manner of constraints growing out of your total self. You need to take into account your temperament, your bent towards the use of logic or emotion, your imaginative

tendencies, your flare for storytelling, your knowledge of and interest in your subject, your self-confidence, your personality, your liberal or conservative nature, and so on.

There is the variable caused by your listening consumer. No two audiences are alike. They differ in size, experience, sex, beliefs, value systems, educational background, their anticipation, and their attitude toward you and your message.

There is also the variable of the situation, the environmental condition surrounding the communication experience. Groups meet for different purposes. You must consider the place, the building, the room, seating facilities, the weather, temperature, and so on. By all means the time of the day, the length of your speech and the timeliness of your subject are important.

You cannot ignore the style and manner in the use of language and delivery. How you plan to say it; the strategies you have in mind for emphasis or clarity contain restraints for creativity in speech organization.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, are the constraints embodied in your subject matter? What do you want to accomplish? Is your prime mission to convey information, energize the mind, spread cheer and joy, stimulate spirits towards more noble attitudes, or arouse action? These various missions will, in part, govern patterns of arrangement and structure of your message materials.

In light of these various constraints, we may assume that if 20 college students similar in age and educational background were asked to give a ten-minute speech on the same subject before the same class, we would have 20 different organizational approaches to that subject.

The outline the student prepares should be his private, prized, personal passport for his particular communication commitment. It has

special meaning for him with the stamp of his mind and labor on it. If he must prepare it knowing it will be scrutinized and graded by his teacher he will be torn between two poles. He must please the teacher on one hand and be answerable to his personal challenge to communicate effectively on the other. He cannot do well serving two masters. Furthermore, a teacher doubly preoccupied with the problems of classroom craftsmanship is hardly in a position to give the outline the careful and sympathetic attention it deserves.

Outlines featuring the traditional rhetorical patterns of logical sequence with Introduction-Body-Conclusion are but means to an end. Outline and structure do not inherently guarantee greatness of speech performance. Some great speeches seem to be without outline or structured form. In fact, I suspect that in a realistic sense we tend to ascribe at times too much sovereignty to the mechanics of rhetoric on this point. Franklyn Haiman remarks: "Surely there is a place even in the communication 'Hall of Fame' for the speech without outline or the phrase that may shock or offend." I can nominate specimens for such hallowed exhibits. I suggest the Sermon on the Mount, Bryan's "Cross of Gold," Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream," and perhaps that great masterpiece of the Chautauqua and Lyceum Platform that was given over 5,000 times, Russell Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds."

Yet, I defend the outline on a general principle. But I do not see the indisputable commandment on "Mount Rhetoric" with "ABSOLUTE" emblazoned on it that says communication cannot exist without Introduction-Body-Conclusion and outlines with sign posts of logic, motivation, needs, satisfaction.

SOLUTION

The outline can serve as a pedagogical device and offer more strategic advantages in some speech classes than others. It has a more valid pedagogical role in a debate class or in

an advanced course in Public Address than in a beginning course. In fact in my debate classes for more than three decades, a required and written brief of 15 pages or more at the end of the semester was a standard fixture. The brief was the basis of 25% of the final grade. But our speech class embraces a different set of goals and different patterns of discipline in the context of the student's realistic needs.

In the overall sense, I feel I can do a better job of teaching basic speech communication by not requiring speech outlines submitted for grading purposes. However, I strongly urge you to make liberal use of outline techniques and make them serve your purpose, not mine. I will also gladly stand available for counsel and suggestions pertaining to your personal problems concerning speech outlining and organization.

## Part II

During the first part of my visit with you, I spoke mostly in a philosophical vein about the role and character of organization and outlining. Now we will take up more practical matters with guidelines and tips for speech outlining and organization.

I. Preliminary to your creative involvement in outlining and organization, keep the following in mind.

   A. The functions of organization.

      1. To make ideas clear and readily understood by listeners.

      2. To enrich speech substance in ratio to time used. This is to attain efficiency by selection of thought materials and their orderly verbal treatment.

3. To help the speaker stick to his subject and purpose.

4. To help the speaker get the desired audience response.

B. Don't expect to find one single sure-fire pattern that you can follow for every speech.

C. Explore and experiment with patterns and methodology to find something that works best for you. Improve your organizational and outlining craftsmanship through trial and error experience.

D. When thought materials and organizational patterns don't seem to jibe, don't bend the subject to make organization look good. The subject and the speaker's purpose must dictate the shape and design of the speech.

II. Select your object and subject.

Give this step high priority. Before you worry and fret too much about your outline or the formal structure of your speech you should make up your mind about two things: 1) What do you want your central thought line to be? 2) What kind of response do you want from your audience? In other words, what is your message and what do you want your listener to take home? Work out a terse analytical sentence prescribing the gist of your subject. Do the same indicating the central concept, attitude, belief or kind of information you want your listener to get. Work on these two statements with care and diligence. You may want to alter and revise these sentences again and again during the process and preparation;

this is good. This will assure unity of substance and singleness of purpose. You may expect at various times following the presentation of a major speech that I will ask for these two sentences to supplement or reinforce my critical appraisal of your assigned performance.

III. The dual purpose outline.

Have a dual purpose outline on the same sheet of paper--one serves as a road map for your thought journey, the other gives markings and signs for audience adaptation. Obviously, the two must be meaningfully integrated, similar to the directions indicated for the performance and acting of a play. Clues for audience adaptation may be made in margins or between the lines by a colored pencil. This corollary outline or system of markings concerning listener response may indicate use of visual aids, attention-getting devices, stylistic rhetorical devices, and special strategic uses of language and delivery. The purpose of the aside clues and directions is to improve your chances for getting meaningful consumer response.

IV. Patterns of thought progression and structure.

Styles or types of organizational approaches are readily influenced by both the nature of the subject matter and the speaker's purpose. Some speeches seem to flow like a river. There is a definite sense of direction, and the scenery on this journey of thinking and feeling is constantly changing. There are various mental pictures, shades of meaning, and kinds of dramatic interest. Often the divisions of

Introduction-Body-Conclusion are not clearly discernible.

Some speeches seem to erupt like a volcano or gush forth like a geyser. They are usually generated by long and deeply-rooted convictions or pent-up emotion. They are commonly without formal structure and are given with little or no advanced preparation. They are often characterized by great moral earnestness and a sharp edge of realism.

Some speeches may be structured more like a stone wall and fitted together piece-by-piece. The outline of thought materials are well-skeletonized. Edmund Burke's "Conciliation With America" is a prime example. Also, we find such models among the briefs prepared for contest debating. Introduction-Body-Conclusion are usually clearly identified. Here the big blocks in the body of the outline are the main issues which, in turn, are reinforced and supported by sub-points which are substantiated by a network of facts, examples, logic, and authoritative listening. Among these specimens of argumentation, there is much to be said for the use of Introduction-Body-Conclusion.

Some speeches may be developed like a string of pearls. Points may be lined up and connected with a common trend of thought, yet each pearl is set apart to give off its own lustre and beauty, producing an altogether unified effect. The song, "Happiness is Different Things to Different People," is a good example of this.

V. Patterns with 7 Sign Posts of What a Speaker Should Do.

A. Wake up audience--get attention.

B. Establish friendly attitude--receptive mind.

C. Why bring up the subject?

D. State the proposition--give sense of direction.

E. Support and develop the central thought line with a network of supporting matter (This is the main business of a speaker.)

F. Capitalize on what you said.

G. Wind up the speech and sign off.

Standard Pattern of the Salesman

(Contact) Stage No. 1

Meet your prospect. Establish favorable contact. Get his attention. Exchange common courtesies.

(Justification) Stage No. 2

Create favorable image of the product. Give highlights of why you are involved in offering it to the public.

(Display) Stage No. 3

Bring your product into the open. Line up and display your wares.

(Demonstration) Stage No. 4

Get down to the real business of showing and explaining why your prospect would find satisfaction and pleasure in having your product. Mention cases, examples, illustrative reasons and testimonials. Answer questions--what? why? where? when? how?

(Conclude and close the sale) Stage No. 5

This is the moment of truth. This stage is the pay-off. Time to state the proposition--explain the deal. Try to find the best strategic moment to pop the question. Shift the burden for action into the lap of the prospect. Maneuver him into a position of making a choice--"Taking it or leaving it."

VI. Some Mechanistic Patterns for Outlining.

A. Topical

Divisions of Introduction-Body-Conclusion are optional. Use only phrases or single words to give clues to a fact or point. Arrange to visualize by looking down the page. May or may not use standard symbols (I, A, 1, a).

B. Complete sentence for each symbol

Usually indicate division: Introduction-Body-Conclusion. Use standard symbols. Test logical sequence by inserting the word "for" or "because"--going down the page from one sentence to the next. This is a common pattern used in debate briefs.

C. Chain Outline

The chain outline goes horizontally across the page. Use single words or telegraphic phrases or cues for

ideas. The first half of my lecture on organization might look something like this:

No required graded outlines--Speech owes much to rhetoric--Speech as academic discipline based on rhetoric--Form: the law of nature, art, human institutions--Speech organization a creative act--highly individualistic--outline is student's private passport--warning about serving two masters: audience and teacher--organization the means not the end--does not guarantee success--Quote Haiman about Hall of Fame speeches without outline--Intro-Body-Conclusion--outline a pedagogical device--best for debate classes--can teach first course best if not compulsory--yet urges its use.

VII. Patterns of Arrangement for Point Development.

A. The natural order: time, place, motion.

B. The "why" order: cause and effect; answers "How Come?" and "So What?"

C. Divide and classify: set up compartments, partitions, categories.

D. Problem-Solution order: Main concerns are: 1) the need picture; 2) plan to meet the need; 3) its practicability; 4) its desirability; 5) possible alternative plans.

E. The screened attack (sometimes called sneak approach). Main goal is guarded or withheld until the most strategic moment in the speech.

F. The climactic order: the accumulation of persuasive force to attain a desired peak of communication effectiveness.

VIII. Bits of Advice Concerning the Introduction and Conclusion.

A. The Introduction.

1. The introduction should whet the appetite of the listener for what you have to say.

2. The introduction should give a strong sense of direction as to where you are going and what you are going to say.

3. Generally keep it short. Get on the beam in a hurry.

4. The notion that you must tell jokes to arouse interest or polarize the audience is highly overrated and overdone. This is risky business. You may create a poor impression of yourself or a wrong impression about your message and purpose.

5. Only use sure-fire stuff. If you have serious doubts about using certain matter, omit it. Play it safe and get on with the subject.

6. As a general rule, work out the central idea first. Let this stand on its own. Figure out the introduction last.

B. The Conclusion.

1. Avoid the long, drawn out conclusion.

2. Beware of the guilt of redundancy in the summary type of conclusion.

3. In this day of time-conscious listeners, try to sign off before their mental buzzers sound.

4. The conclusion must give the audience the sense that the job is complete. We don't like to see a freight train without a caboose.

IX. Odds and Ends.

A. Don't have too many points in your speech.

B. Avoid main points that are too similar.

C. First and last be concerned about bringing forth the heart and substance of your message. Once you do a good job at this, the problems of working out an Introduction and Conclusion tend to vanish.

D. When making short talks bring out your best points first.

E. Sometimes, if outlining and structuring bug you too much and seem to get in your way, select a few key points or concepts from your subject and try to see how much essential matter you can cover by oral or mental rehearsal in a limited space of time. Make a few practice runs of this type and if a structure pattern does not emerge just forget all about oranization and outlining. Focus on a few main things you want to say--say them and sit down.

WHEN ONE MAN FACES ANOTHER:
FOUR DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNICATION

(Presented while Buehler was a visiting Professor, 1964-1969 at the Universities of Texas, Hawaii, Nebraska.)

Central Goal: MORE LIGHT about the phenomenon of human communication.

> "Death is that state of the body when it can no longer communicate with its environment." --Henry Drummond

Communication is that thing by which man lives and has his being.

(1) Birds, animals, fish, insects must communicate to survive.

(2) Man has double advantage over all other living creatures: (A) superior intelligence; (B) the miracle of speech.

Some markings of the communication occurrence.

(1) Contact between giver and receiver.

(2) Identification--people, angels, stars have names.

(3) Interaction based upon common core of experience or interest.

(4) Level of mutual satisfaction governed more by concern for what is probably true or wise than who is right and wrong.

(5) Communication is best when inner equilibrium of parties involved is least disturbed.

Unique difficulties hinder or aggravate communication efforts in U.S.A. today.

(1) Knowledge explosion. As volume of knowledge increases the volume of ignorance for an individual increases proportionately. Communication and knowledge are interdependent.

(2) Communication often stumbles over its own feet. As we shrink space and time and spiral the growth of communication devices by language and electronics, we tend to destroy the communication needs of the individual. Witness communication failures among families and groups in our cities.

(3) We have become a "trigger-happy" people in the use of words. The images of violence fed us by the press, radio, T.V., movies and the disruption on streets and campuses breeds an irrepressible use of power words, vulgarity, and profanity, causing a breakdown in communication never dreamed of a generation ago. Physical violence and language violence often complement each other.

(4) We are a "scoreboard-conscious" people. We overreact to playing games, to scoring points, to winning a victory--thereby creating mental and emotional sets which hinder the search for what is true or wise. Friendly discussions often turn into bitter personal arguments to be settled by violence--fists, knives, guns. Emotional investments bankrupt the mind.

## In Search for a Communication Model

Communication, not like a wheel, or house, or a geometric figure, is more like an atom with power to set off chain reaction. The main catalyzers are people, ideas, circumstances and codes of meaning. In other words, the key dimensions are: (1) Image of speakers and listeners; (2) Message; (3) Conditions of time, place and purpose; (4) Medium of transfer verbal and extra-verbal.

FIRST DIMENSION--PERSON TO PERSON, IMAGE TO IMAGE, ROLE TO ROLE, WHO TO WHOM.

Listeners ask: Who is this? Where is he from? What does he do? What is he up to? What he is may speak louder than what he says.

Two major factors create image.

(1) Trust credibility

1. Expertness
2. Attractiveness--likeable
3. Integrity
4. Conformity--avoids extremes
5. Radiates kindness and goodwill.

(2) Status

1. Office, rank, boss level, top guy
2. Special achievement, honor, recognition
3. Special role of respect or leadership granted by tradition or common consent. Like Master-disciple, Parent-child, Teacher-student.

Thoughts to keep in mind:

(1) Image never static, always in state of flux. May change overnight from "Crown him" to "Crucify him."

(2) Image subject to a degree of control. Guidelines:

1. Create image of kindness and goodwill.

2. Create image of fair-mindedness, justice.

3. Create image of being knowledgeable about subject.

4. Create image of concern about principles, not persons.

5. Create image you prefer facts and logic more than opinion.

6. Create image of self-confidence.

7. Create image you are reliable--you don't aim to trick anybody.

SECOND DIMENSION: SPEAKER'S PRODUCT--SUBJECT MATTER--IDEAS.

This part of the study concerns confrontation of minds in matters of beliefs, opinions, attitudes, value systems, prejudices, likes and dislikes in context of human communication efforts.

(1) Usually this is the pivot dimension in the whole orbit of communication experiences. It concerns ideas, the stuff that governs man's destiny. We can't kill ideas by fire or bullets. Note ideas of Moses, Jesus, Plato, Jefferson, Lincoln are still with us.

(2) This is the most difficult, the most challenging and most frustrating part of our study. Why?

1. We come to grips with many human equations. Man is a strange, mysterious creature governed by a mixture of emotion and logic. We must search for a proper balance of both.

2. Logic alone is not enough. "The madman isn't the one who has lost his reason. The madman is the one who has lost everything except his reason"--Gilbert Chesterton. Pure logic alone is suicidal. We don't get babies that way.

3. Emotion alone is not enough. It is full of booby traps that produce violence, murder, mental cruelty, even wars with atrocities unspeakable. Good emotions properly channeled can be the salvation of man--producing peace and goodwill.

4. All logic can take the fun out of life. Happiness has its moorings in our emotional nature.

5. To think clearly without confusion is hard work and few are capable of it. To act on emotion is the easy, lazy way. "Emotions can never be the substitute for intelligence"--Adlai Stevenson.

6. Language of heart and head are often in conflict. What the heart says contains the greater risk. Note the greater difference in the language of the heart of Joan of Arc, John Brown, Benedict Arnold, Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King, the Buddhist monk who dies by fire, the

Chinese mother who sacrifices her baby to appease the gods. How come these differences? Didn't they all heed the language of the heart? We are all prone to carry a kind of divine right of authority that comes from our mother's knee. But we don't have the same mother and there is the rub. The most common thing we humans have is our difference. What is one man's treasure is another man's trash.

Four areas of controversy where mental and emotional sets cause most friction, frustration and possible violence.

(1) Religion. Example: Christians fed to the lions caused some of the bloodiest wars; note bloodshed and violence among Protestants and Catholics in Ireland today; prejudice kept a Catholic out of the White House for nearly two centuries.

(2) Race relations. Examples: Hitler and supremacy of the Nordic race; trail of blood and misery racism caused in free America; note treatment of minorities--Indians, Mexicans, Jews, Blacks, etc.

(3) Politics. Examples: Most bars are closed on election day to curb fights and disorders; many clubs cancel social functions months before a crucial election.

(4) Personal morality and ethics. Individual attitudes about gambling, drinking, smoking, drugs, sexual behavior, business practices, cheating are touchy matters which often trigger violent emotional reaction which foul up communication lines.

Some guidelines that might be useful:

(1) When emotional level is high during process of decision-making or formulating policy, call for a recess or cooling-off period.

(2) Keep your eye on principles and merits of issues, not personalities.

(3) Keep talking--don't start shooting. Violence may blow the fuse on the hotline by which your survival depends.

(4) Keep asking questions--Wouldn't it be better to do it this way?; Wouldn't it be wiser if we tried this?, etc.

(5) Try role-playing. Quote the Indian's prayer: "Great Spirit, Grant that I may not criticize my neighbor until I have walked a mile in his moccasins."

(6) Once every day for one month quote the meditative mood: "We tend to see and hear the things in this world, not as they really are but as we are."

THIRD DIMENSION: CIRCUMSTANCES--TIME, PLACE, OCCASION.

TIME--Time talks.

It may speak louder than words. It tells us about the stars, the rocks, the plants and all living creatures past and present. It is the stuff of which life is made.

(1) "Greater than an army is an idea whose time has come"--Victor Hugo

1. Twenty centuries ago, time for the coming of Christianity.

2. Two centuries ago, time for the rise of free government.

3. Present century, time for decline of imperialism, rise of international mindedness, explosion of science knowledge.

4. Present generation, concerned about racial relations, family planning, pollution, sex education, etc.

(2) Time imposes restraints upon communication efforts.

1. Things about what is practical and logical go best during the daytime; emotions are more operative at night. We make love, save souls and impose a curfew at night.

2. Time ties strings to speakers. They must observe time limits and await their turn to speak.

(3) Time governs success or failure of our actions.

1. We do things on schedule--eat, sleep, put out the cat, mail a letter, plant and harvest crops, go to the office, church, school, etc.

2. We use time as an instrument of strategy. We move into Cambodia to buy time. We buy and sell things when time is right. We go to the doctor on time to protect life and limb, take pills by the clock.

3. Timely events and happenings may disturb inner equilibrium of speaker or listener, thus making communication almost impossible. Fire, severe storms, the assassination of a popular public figure, riots, etc. may cause

strong interference in communication.

PLACE--It matters where the communication takes place.

(1) Immediate physical setting governs mood of dialogue of participants, such as size and shape of room, temperature, lights, noise, furnishings, etc.

(2) Psychological communication effected, be it in the woodshed, in the automobile, church pew, street corner, bosses office, etc.

(3) Communication influenced by place in international affairs. Examples: Geneva for Red Cross, New York for U.N., Paris for Vietnam War Peace Conference, etc.

OCCASION--Purpose of meeting.

(1) Some meetings are simple or routine like church, school or civic clubs; some are special like funerals; some are on call like an emergency council or board of directors meeting; some are spontaneous like a victory celebration or a riot.

(2) Important that message interchange is in keeping with the occasion. Don't expect the Gettysburg Address at a football rally.

FOURTH DIMENSION: MEDIUM OF TRANSFER OF MESSAGE.

The way the product is packaged, displayed and distributed to the listener consumer heightens its value. For Vice-President Agnew the medium is the message. There are many unique and distinctive codes of meaning. We mention two: (1) extra-verbal and (2) verbal. They are

commonly used concurrently and complement each other.

(1) The Extra-verbal

1. In a broad sense almost everything we do tells something about us. We give clues by the way we walk, eat, smile, frown, chew gum, wear clothes, use perfume, shake hands, bat our eyes, etc. Often action speaks louder than words. Probably half the married folks never heard the words, "Will you marry me?"

2. Note sample list of message clues common in use: flower, money, gifts, flags, bells, music, whistles, lights, picket lines, parades, uniforms, badges, jewelry, beards, dress, bumper stickers, etc. They all say something.

3. Meaning codes which represent a kind of "body rhetoric." Note the wide range from the innocuous to the violent. Examples: Plague of Egypt, the burning bush, miracles of Jesus, the Boston Tea Party, protest marches, the guillotine, mob riots, fire bombs.

(2) The Verbal

Language is man's prime tool for living and seeking happiness. If the chief Devil would destroy the human race on earth, he would not chose the hydrogen bomb or poisonous chemicals, but would strike his master blow by destroying all use of language--written and spoken. This would be like the Tower of Babel multiplied a million times.

Two kinds of words: (1) Denotative; (2) Connotative.

(1) Denotative words are objective, logical, with meanings identified by the senses--cow, hammer, ball.

(2) Connotative words are subjective, beyond the reach of the senses-- out of this world, so to speak. Meanings cannot be measured by a yardstick. Some words are loaded with emotion that bless or curse the human race. Some are stigma words, like coward, pig, bum, traitor. Some are scare words, like goblin, monster, evil spirit. Some connote a blessing, like brother, neighbor, Merry Christmas.

The crucial challenge: The constitutional code for freedom of speech and press harbors the seeds which threaten democracy itself. The constitution closed the freedom gap in its provision for speech and press, but this generation inherits a responsibility gap for the use of language.

(1) We have come a long way toward providing laws and raising public conscience to protect life and property from violence, but are found wanting in ways to protect ourselves from harm done by words.

(2) Extremists bent on violence enjoy a kind of legal immunity in the exercise of violence in the use of language. Words are like butcher knives which can be used to create or destroy.

# ARE YOU LISTENING?

(From a speech prepared for the 30th Annual
Steelworkers Institute - July 1976
The University of Kansas)

Listening is the most difficult to do without. It was Helen Keller's first choice among the sensory communication experiences. Of the four language arts--reading, writing, speaking, and listening--listening is the oldest, used by far the most, and the one about which we have done the least in the educational sense.

How come educators have neglected the study and practice of listening behavior? Why have educators for centuries stressed the need for developing and improving those language arts other than listening?

Listening is difficult to understand. It is much more than hearing ability. It is a very complex process with deep roots in interpersonal behavior, in the areas of psychology, sociology, psychiatry, and individual personality.

Fritz Kreisler proclaimed that music is the most emotional of all arts. Likewise, listening ventures are the most emotional of the language arts. We tend to take listening for granted. It is something we do naturally, like breathing. It is not something you can teach. In my profession as a speech teacher, I heard very little about listening as part of our academic discipline until World War II. We have long been concerned about speech pathology and hearing difficulties, but listening as a skill or an art is something else. It concerns human interaction, mental and emotional disturbances, inner balance, and structured prejudices in matters of race, religion, politics and morals. It is also linked to semantic snarls in language, to life style, and to differences in character and personality.

Listening is a big part of the total process of human communication and of all human action and reaction. We listen with our mind and heart and our state of health--physical and mental. We listen with our eyes, stomach, toes, and nose. For many of you, how well you listen to me at this moment depends upon your arthritic conditions. For some it will be the comfort of this room, what you had for breakfast, how well you slept. Some of you will tune me out wondering what is going on at home, how to get along with so and so.

There are two hard core factors which have much to do with clear channel listening. The first is the make-up of your "ego-involved priorities." How does what you hear protect and reinforce your self-concept, your feeling of self-importance, your sense of pride--ranging from pure vanity or selfish conceit to inner dignity? If someone infers you are stupid, a dummy, a liar, a bastard, a coward, then what happens? Your feelings are hurt. You get mad. You have been struck a blow in your inner solar plexus. You turn a deaf ear to what is said, or you may explode into arrogance, wrath, even violence.

The second hard core factor is encased in the image of the speaker--the source of the message you hear. We call this "speaker credibility." This is largely based upon three things: 1. How much do you trust the speaker? 2. How well do you like him? 3. What is your level of respect for him--his ability, his knowledge, and his role as an expert?

When one person speaks to another there are always four dimensions of communication involved. These dimensions come, not in separate parts like nuts, bolts and screws, but more like atoms, setting off a kind of chain reaction which mysteriously affects the level of effective listening and the total process of communication. The first dimension I call "people"--senders and receivers of messages, the producers and consumers of ideas and feelings. In other words, <u>who</u> says <u>what</u> to <u>whom</u>. The second dimension concerns the

"message," the subject matter, the merchandise of thought and emotion. In other words, "what is said." The third dimension is the "circumstance," the condition or the setting of the communication occurrence. In other words, time, place, and why does this happen. The fourth dimension is the "medium of transfer" or presentation of the message. This involves language, delivery, and all kinds of nonverbal things--eyes, whiskers, dress, etc.

Some common faulty notions have been a barrier to the study of listening improvement. I will mention a few. "Listening can't be taught." Not so. It can be taught. "The bright student with the highest IQ should be the best listener." Not so. Some illiterates are the best listeners. "Reading ability goes with listening ability." Not so. Schools existed centuries before the printing press. "Effective listening is easy, takes no effort." Not so. It takes work, concentration, and strong determination.

In the broad sense listening serves the following purposes. One, we listen for sheer pleasure, for fun and amusement. Two, we listen to bring glad strength to the spiritual side of our nature. We find this in music, poetry, song, sermon, and celebrations. The inner man needs inspiration. Three, we listen for information, to learn something new. Four, we listen for critical evaluation. Critical listening is by far the most difficult and challenging. This demands thinking without confusion. It demands an objective, impersonal attitude. Here we let the test tube talk. We ask what does the yardstick say, the thermometer, the calendar. Here the law of logic and the scientific attitude get top priority. Unfortunately, some never become qualified for this kind of listening.

Now let's look at some common barriers or hazards to effective listening. We all tend to get sidetracked or tripped up by things that spoil the message--a mispronounced word, a grammatical error, a vulgar expression, a sour face, an awkward posture, and so on. People

turn off the television because they don't like the hairy look of the speaker. A probing mind in search of truth can't care much about the speaker's color of skin, where he goes to church, or who sleeps with whom. When you are mentally or emotionally disturbed you risk blocking yourself out from good listening. The same is true when you are engaged in private planning or just daydreaming. When we listen to ideas related to controversial matters, we are tempted to give more time and effort to refute what is said than to get the real meaning from it.

A good listener trys to get the intended meaning of what is said without reading something into it to suit himself. He tries to get the whole picture without picking out only what sounds good to him and letting the rest fall on deaf ears.

Emotional and intellectual listening are two different ball games. To listen only with your head or only with your heart won't do. The proper blending of the two may produce wisdom. A good measure of compassion on the part of both sender and receiver will do wonders to keep them from destroying each other.

We often tend to look up to the speaker and down upon the listener. We tend to think of the speaker as the top guy. This can be a foolish notion. It is better to think of speaker and listener as being of equal importance. They need each other on a two-way street. The speaker has by far the greater responsibility and risks the most. He sticks his neck out. The listener can relax, take it easy, take home what he hears, replay parts of what he heard, perhaps tear it to pieces or reclaim what is useful for him. The listener may learn more from what he hears than the speaker realizes.

Lest we forget, the listener also has at his command the eloquence of silence. Silence may often be the miracle weapon of communication. Remember the story about

"SILENT CAL" who listened his way to the White House.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## Remembering the Chautauqua

# *E. C. BUEHLER*

## *Actor—Lecturer*

***Interpreter of Poetry and Drama***

1. Lecture-recital—"Walking Dust."
2. Dramatic Interpretation—"He Knew Lincoln," by Ida M. Tarbell.
3. Lecture-recital—Contemporary Poetry.
4. Scenes from Shakespeare.
5. Miscellaneous Readings.

# WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN--AN EYE-WITNESS REPORT

(From The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho,
March 1948, Vol. 30, No.3)

This is a request number. For some time our editor has been urging me to tell some of my personal experiences with the boy orator of the Platte. I have always admired Mr. Bryan as an orator. He was from my home state and lived 35 miles from us. Therefore, I had several opportunities in my early youth to hear Mr. Bryan at political meetings and at the Lincoln Epworth Assembly. Later I was crew boy on the Redpath Horner Chautauquas, and Bryan was a sure-fire feature attraction. Although I heard him many times, there are three incidents which stand out above all the others. The first was a political stump speech, the second a Chautauqua oration "The Prince of Peace," and the third a double-feature lecture on "Evolution" and "Prohibition," which was delivered shortly before his death.

The first time I heard Mr. Bryan was in 1908 on his Presidential campaign tour against William Howard Taft as he spoke from the rear platform of a railroad train. I was in the seventh or eighth grade of the country school, and we were in the midst of the cornhusking season. However, on the day when Mr. Bryan was scheduled to appear at the nearest town, almost everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike, took time off to hear the Great Commoner.

There was an immense crowd at the little railroad station, mostly country folks in calico and overalls. To me the crowd was a bit awesome and terrifying. Flags and buntings were flying everywhere. The train was a little late, and the engineer seemed to be worried about the masses which were overrunning the railroad track. His whistle shrieked wildly when the train was still blocks away, but the people finally managed to get off the tracks and, I presume for safety reasons, he overran

the station some hundred yards. There was a wild scramble as hundreds rushed to get a close-up view of Mr. Bryan.

My cousin, who was a few years older than I, had the good fortune to be in the front ranks and, being fleet of foot, was among the first to reach the rear platform of the train. Mr. Bryan was standing there waving and smiling and at once reached out to shake hands with a few of his admirers. Among the few that shook his hand was my cousin, Arthur. I recall how we looked with awe and admiration on my cousin for having touched the hand of Mr. Bryan, for to us Mr. Bryan was more than a political candidate running for the Presidency. To many of us he was greater than the President of the United States. We somehow felt that he had Providence on his side and that he had a divine calling to lead the common people against the evils of Wall Street.

In our simple faith, Mr. Bryan was a man of high ideals and unquestionable character. His speech on that day was only five minutes long; and, of course, no one ever remembered anything he said, but I am sure no one could ever forget the friendly manner and the spiritual warmth which radiated from him. He won many hearts and many votes in that Republican community.

The second incident I want to tell about took place several years later on the Chautauqua platform. Although Mr. Bryan was defeated three times at the polls, he still was a great American hero. He was considered by almost everyone to be the greatest orator of the day. He drew vast crowds on the Chautauqua, and his success on the platform was unrivaled.

On this particular Sunday night he was appearing at eight o'clock at Fort Scott, Kansas, as our headline feature. It was a hot day with a temperature of 100 in the shade. On that Sunday afternoon he spoke at Parsons, Kansas, which was some 70 miles away. It was all in a day's work for Mr. Bryan to make two or three speeches and drive from town to town in a

Model-T Ford over the dusty, hot Kansas roads. When Mr. Bryan stepped out of the Model-T Ford, he was no weary traveler. After going promptly to his hotel room to freshen up, he would enjoy a hearty dinner. He was a big eater, often placing a double order with the waiter. On this particular evening when he stepped on the platform all fresh in his white flannel trousers, he looked as clean and fresh as a bathed and powdered baby. His cool, calm appearance was almost breathaking to his perspiring audience.

This was my first experience in preparing the stage for Mr. Bryan. The instructions were to have a simple background of flags with no furniture, no chairs or speaker's stand on the stage. All he wanted was a simple, four-legged stand with a wash basin containing a big cake of ice beside which there was a tall, glass water pitcher full of ice water and a tall glass tumbler. I recall that it took some time to round up these few simple stage properties.

As the moment arrived for Mr. Bryan's appearance that evening, the audience seemed to polarize itself into a mood of hushed expectancy. Hundreds of people were standing. Suddenly people seemed to stop talking. Conversation died down, and everyone was waiting for the dramatic and impressive entrance of the Chautauqua Superintendent and the speaker of the evening. At last the moment arrived, but the Superintendent stepped out on the platform alone. There were muffled groans. People began to wonder if Mr. Bryan had failed to make it in his trusty Ford. The Superintendent made a short introductory speech of about 30 seconds, but Mr. Bryan kept out of sight. He was hiding behind the backdrop of bunting and flags.

He waited about 15 seconds after the Superintendent stepped off the platform and then, modestly and in stately manner, strolled towards his place beside the water pitcher and the cake of ice, carrying a big palm leaf fan. There was a long, loud swell of applause which Mr. Bryan acknowledged with the grace of a

prima donna taking curtain calls at a premiere performance. How he charmed that audience with his bows and smiles even before he said a word! He was the most impressive person on the platform. We felt about him as Carlyle felt about Webster. We wondered if any man could be as great as Bryan looked.

I'll never forget that speech. The setting with respect to the mental attitude of the audience was perfect. The European War with its hate and destruction gave an ironic background to this rhapsody of love and peace. It was just what the people wanted to hear. For a whole hour and a half, Mr. Bryan poured forth in his best style and grandest oratorical manner his story about mankind living at peace. He gave words of comfort and assurance. There was that spiritual glow to the ideas of love and brotherhood.

How perfectly his manner blended with his message! It was poetry for the eyes as well as for the ears. Here was this magnificent figure against the background of the Stars and Stripes. His every movement was an expression of grace and poise. With his left hand he fanned himself with his big palm leaf fan and, with rhythmical regularity with his other hand, he would wet his fingers on the cake of ice and soothingly stroke his brow and bald head. It was soothing and cooling for the audience just to watch him.

From time to time he would reach the climax of a point, and the audience would puncture his oratorical highlights with bursts of applause. Mr. Bryan would take advantage of these moments and pour out a tumbler full of water and gulp it down in two swallows, almost unnoticeably. Before long the pitcher of water was empty, and the flannel trousers had a big perspiration spot a foot long on each knee. He lost himself in his message as he approached the climax, and forgot about his fan and his cake of ice. There was a magic spell over all listeners as he took them out of this world. For both speaker and audience, there was that "fling at

the moon" that no speech teacher or psychologist can yet explain.

The third incident which I want to tell about is a striking contrast to the former two. It took place in Evanston, Illinois, when I was a graduate student in the School of Speech at Northwestern University. It was four o'clock Sunday afternoon on a particularly bright day in the month of May in the '20s. It was a perfect day to be out-of-doors, and to spend such a beautiful afternoon in a stuffy old church didn't make sense. But Mr. Bryan was scheduled to appear on a community lecture course at four o'clock in the Methodist Church. At three o'clock the church was full. Standing room only! People wanted to hear the former Secretary of State, the thrice defeated Presidential candidate, the man who still was perhaps the most influential politician on the American scene and who undoubtedly was the greatest orator of the time.

It was a different Bryan from the Chautauqua days. Here was a man, mellowed by years of rich experience in public life, filled with the sense of comedy. He was still the master orator. He talked about Evolution. Perhaps not one in ten agreed with what he said. Any college debater could detect the holes in his arguments, and yet he charmed his listeners and held them spellbound for an hour and a half.

After the close of his address, there was generous applause, and Mr. Bryan gulped down two or three glasses of water. Then smiling graciously, he turned to the Chairman and calmly announced that he would now make a second speech on his favorite subject, "Prohibition," and for another hour and 15 minutes he continued to cast the magic spell over that packed house. The standing audience did not leave. I recall walking back towards the campus with Mr. Ralph Dennis, Dean of the School of Speech of Northwestern University, after this double-feature. The Dean offered one final word of appraisal, "There is only one man who could hold this smug, complacent

audience of Evanston for two hours and 45 minutes on a beautiful Sunday afternoon, and that man is William Jennings Bryan."

## CULTURE UNDER CANVAS

(This is a lecture given on July 16, 1969, at South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota. The occasion is a summer program of cultural enrichment.)

Thank you, Bob Oliver, for those kind, gracious remarks that you have made about me. I feel honored indeed to be on the same program with Dr. Robert Oliver. In a seminar at the University of Kansas in the fall semester, we took a private poll as to who were the outstanding men in our profession, and Robert Oliver was in the top ten. I am deeply pleased, of course, to be up here in South Dakota, this land where your state is famous for its stone faces and for Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull. You know that my adopted state and your state would be adjoining neighbors if it hadn't been for my native state, Nebraska, that got in between us. Well, I am happy to report that the sunflowers of Kansas are blowing kisses across the badlands of Nebraska to you coyotes up here in South Dakota.

Yes, I know, I too have wondered at times what good can come from Kansas, for isn't that the state where they have more political crackpots and more grasshoppers and jackrabbits than any state in the union? Well, it isn't all bad down there in this land of the Wizard of Oz, the land of cyclones and dust storms. For out of all this muck and turmoil come beautiful women, for Kansas leads the nation in producing winners in the Miss America contest. I thought I'd better mention this so you wouldn't get the impression that we are all wind down there. Of course I feel all set to be called off the bench. I am, I suppose, an experienced benchwarmer, and I feel proud to get out here and feel the plains. I feel lucky that I was assigned a position where I feel at home--the chautauqua, for the chautauqua really means a lot to me.

The chautauqua played a unique role in my life and has left a marked impression upon me. This is where I acquired a nickname, "Bill," and of course this name really became my real name among colleagues and friends. My wife always calls me Bill except once in awhile when there's some crisis or some difficulty, when she will say "Now listen, Ezra Christian...." But it was the chautauqua that really influenced me to move towards college and get a college education, and later it was a major influence that led me finally into the field of teaching speech. It was my good fortune in my youth to hear many famous men from the public platform. I became an ardent fan of public speakers of both the lyceum and chautauqua. I think I was a very serious-minded lad, and somehow or another I preferred oratory to some of the famous bands and symphony orchestras. I remember walking out on John Philip Sousa, so I would have enough energy and strength to listen to a lecture later on in the program.

Now take a quick look with me as I turn the pages of this oral album, and I'll introduce to you a few men whom I heard before 1910-25. Yes, I was there, Charlie. First, I present Teddy Roosevelt. I was very young, probably nine or ten, and of course I don't remember anything he said. But I do remember his flashing teeth. I remember his spectacles and his striped pants, but what impressed me most was how the audience seemed to have a worshipful attitude. Now meet another ex-President, William Howard Taft. He really should play Santa Claus; he's built for it. He was a warm, friendly man full of chuckles, but he was delightfully dull and boring. He was nice to have around, something like a St. Bernard dog. He was comfortable. Now meet one of the most polished orators of the time: Senator Albert Beveridge of Indiana. Oh, it was beautiful to hear him and watch him; every gesture and every inflection demonstrated mastery of platform skill. His speeches were memorized to the last letter, and he gave an impressive performance. We would have to give him an "A" on the basis of outward rhetoric, but he had very little impact upon the

audience. I think speech teachers probably would give him a "C" today.

Now, by contrast, I want you to meet the celebrated evangelist, Billy Sunday. Billy Sunday started out on the chautauqua circuit but, because he received only $75 a week, he soon became a talent drop-out and developed his own sawdust trail which proved much more lucrative. He somehow or another was the past master of reaping a harvest by means of the collection plate. He always reminded both saints and sinners that the Lord loveth a cheerful giver. And I suppose he probably would be classified as a millionaire on the basis of today's dollars. He was a master showman, a jumping jack in the pulpit. I remember well his take-off on his famous temperance sermon. This was in the Tabernacle in Kansas City, and I was a freshman in college. The auditorium was packed with 12,000 people and after the choir finished its warm-up or its tune-up services, Billy Sunday strode out across the platform and stepped to the front edge. In that moment of silence he stood on his toes, raised his hands, and shouted in a husky voice, "All hell's full of booze!" And he walked away. And for the next thirty minutes he turned on the emotional harangue. Little rhetoric, but a lot of communication impact.

Now meet my favorite--one of my favorites at least--Judge Kenesaw Landis, who was a federal judge, but he was also the first commissioner of baseball. His manner was that of a criminal lawyer rather than an orator. His purpose was to stimulate clear thinking rather than build emotional fires. He was an impressive figure with a chiseled face. He was dignified. He had a shock of white hair. He made few gestures, but when he did gesture he seemed to gesture with the pores of his skin and his whole body. His one and only key gesture was what we call the index finger gesture, and you could usually see it coming. He would pull it out of his pocket, and you could sense that he was coming to the climax of a point. Then he would shake it, and sparks

would fly all over the audience. This is what we speech teachers used to call the ictus in a gesture: I-C-T-U-S. This means putting the kick into it, and Kenesaw Landis was the master of putting the kick into his gestures.

Now meet the champion long-winded orator of the chautauqua platform, Senator Robert M. La Follette. I heard him many times, but I want to tell you about the time when I was 15 years old, when he was at the Lincoln Epworth Assembly in Lincoln, Nebraska. He lambasted the trusts for three and one-half hours. He was deadly serious; there was no humor, nothing of the inspirational type. It was hammer and tongs all the way. It was a hard-hitting first affirmative debate speech that had no end, and this was by the progressive U.S. senator. He didn't even pause for a drink of water.

Now I want you to meet the man who gave the best-known and the most popular lecture of all: Russell Conwell. He was a Baptist minister who made his living on the platform by his famous lecture, "Acres of Diamonds." Conwell was not the greatest to draw crowds, but his speech "Acres of Diamonds" had a steady, long-lasting appeal that covered a half-century. It was given more than 5,000 times and netted more than $3,000,000, and it built Temple University. He provided scholarships for hundreds of deserving students. I heard his speech at about the five thousand mark; it was an unforgettable evening. In two minutes he won the attention of his audience; in five minutes he enchanted his audience, and then he held the audience spellbound for an hour and a half. But he said things that people liked to hear. His lecture was popular. He did not make it a sin to get rich. Money, he said, was power, and power should be in the hands of good people. The Lord loveth a rich man who uses his talents to make money for good purposes. His central idea was: Don't look for wealth where you think that the grass is greener across the fence or in some far land; look for it in your own back yard. There are diamonds--acres of diamonds--in your own back yard.

Now I want you to meet the greatest of them all, the king of the chautauqua: William Jennings Bryan. He was known as the silver-tongued orator, the Great Commoner, the orator of the plains, and his most famous chautauqua speech was "The Prince of Peace," which he gave over 2,000 times. Now, he never used a note or demanded a podium. He used very little humor. He never shouted or pounded the table. He never was hoarse. He never missed an engagement because of sickness, never used slang expressions, never put the personal sting in a word that he ever used. He always seemed as fresh as a daisy, always at ease and relaxed, yet forceful. He had magic power in his voice. He skyrocketed to political fame at the age of 36 at the Chicago Democratic Convention, largely because of his voice. He was the only speaker the noisy convention crowd could hear. Once, in 1915, he spoke to 100,000 people in San Francisco without a microphone, and these thousands stood through a whole hour that was interspersed with two rainshowers. He had a most remarkable pipe organ type of voice, and he was in a class by himself. I would say that he had oracular charisma.

I heard him many times, but I want to tell you about three experiences. The first one was when I was about 12 or 14 years old around 1908. Bryan was running for the Presidency for the Democratic Party, and it was cornhusking time. We were a Republican family, but William Jennings Bryan was coming through Crab Orchard, so at ten o'clock we stopped all the wagons, drove home and unharnessed the teams, got into the spring wagon, and drove to Crab Orchard. The train came through there a little after twelve. It was a little late, but I still can see that short train of four coaches coming down the railroad track. The jets of steam were streaming out; the flags were out, and the engineer was whistling for the crowd to break away. He overran the platform by 75 yards and the crowd ran to touch William Jennings Bryan. My cousin, Arthur Starkebaum, who was four years older than I and who could run faster than I, got to the platform and was the second man to shake hands with William Jennings Bryan.

We were impressed. We could hardly wait until Sunday School was over and the sermon was over so we could gather outside and could all go around and touch Arthur because he shook hands with William Jennings Bryan.

The second time I heard him was in Fort Scott, Kansas. The temperature was 107°. It was Sunday, and he was giving his speech "The Prince of Peace." I was the crew-boy of the Chautauqua, and I had to supply the stage properties. My business was to set up the stage when there was no podium, but one little stand. On that stand there must be a simple little basin with a 25 pound piece of ice. Next to the basin was a big pitcher of water that held about two gallons and one big tumbler. That's all he wanted. Well, the house was packed with three or four hundred people standing in the back. When Mr. Bryan was introduced, he stepped out, and the audience cheered. And Bryan, in prima donna fashion, knew just how to quiet them down, and he started out.

What interested me was his air conditioning system of that day. He had a big palm-leaf fan with which he fanned himself and, after he spoke a minute or so, he reached over to his cake of ice, put his fingers on it, then cooled his forehead. He was pretty bald, and that fan would just cool him. And he'd come towards a big point in his speech--a sort of summary or climax--and the audience would cheer. That was his clue to pour himself a tumbler full of water and drink it in about two or three gulps. This went on throughout his speech and, after about 40 minutes, his beautiful, white flannel trousers began to get a little droopy around the knees and large perspiration blotches showed up. By the time he was through, the cake of ice was pretty small, the water was gone, but Bryan was going strong. But remember that he gave that same lecture at two o'clock in Parsons, Kansas, and then drove on that dusty road to Fort Scott and stepped out again as fresh as a daisy. Sometimes he did that three times a day.

Now, the third time I heard him was at Northwestern University while I was a graduate student. He spoke in the Methodist Chruch at four o'clock on a spring afternoon late in May. The birds were singing, and it was lovely outside. But I said, I must hear my idol. So I went to the church expecting to get a very comfortable seat at three o'clock, and the ushers met me, bowed nicely, and said, "Sorry sir, standing room only." "Well, I can't give up, so I'll stand." So I stood--there were many, many, many more who stood. And finally at four o'clock he was introduced by the community chairman. Bryan spoke for an hour and a half on evolution, and after he finished the audience gave a rousing cheer. He drank about three glases of water, bowed, smiled and said, "Now I'd like to say a few words about my favorite subject, prohibition." And he spoke for another hour and ten minutes on prohibition, and I was still standing. I walked home with Dean Dennis of the School of Speech, Northwestern University, and he said to me, "Bill, there's only one man in the world who could hold an audience on a nice day like this in this slumbering community, and his name is William Jennings Bryan."

Now, Mr. Bryan, three times Presidential candidate, Secretary of State, and leader of the Democratic Party for 30 years, loved the Chautauqua platform. It was his home; it was his way of life. He was, in a way, a kind of compulsive hum, but he felt that the Lord was on his side. He gave the best part of his life and his finest talents to the Chautauqua platform. One of his favorite subjects was prohibition, and of course I can understand, he never really needed anything to stimulate him. He was always in a kind of divinely intoxicated state from the audiences he met that stimulated him.

Well, who knows what mark he might have made upon our nation as a statesman or as a public servant if he had given the same type of talent, energy, and dedication to service of the government.

Now I'm going to play for you one sample of his voice. This is in a sense a program of "show and tell," and I can just tell but can't show much. This is the last part of his "Cross of Gold" speech. Remember that this was given in a studio some 60 years ago when electronics were not developed at such a sophisticated level.

Playback of Bryan's Voice

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention, I would be presumptuous indeed to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were a mere measuring of abilities. But this is not a contest between persons. The humblest citizen in all the land, when carried in the arm of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error. I come to speak here in the defense of a cause as holy as the cause of liberty: the cause of humanity. Mr. Carlisle said in 1878, that this was a struggle between "the idol holders of idle capital" and "the struggling masses" who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country. They tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. We reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city of the country. We care not upon what line the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good but that we cannot have it until other nations help us, we reply then that, instead of having a gold standard because England has, we will restore bimetallism and then let England have bimetallism because the United States

has. If they dare to come out in the open fields and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we will fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of this nation and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests, and the toilers everywhere. We will answer the demand for a gold standard by saying to them, "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

So much for the journalism of my visit. Now let's get down to something a little more solid that has a little more of the earmarks of rhetoric. Let's examine the anatomy of the chautauqua. Let's take a look at this American phenomenon of the last frontier. Let's ask some questions. First, what is this thing called chautauqua? Originally, the name was spelled with a capital letter, referring to a lake 30 miles long and five to eight miles wide in New York about 75 miles south of Niagara Falls. But spelled with a small letter, it has four parts to its meaning: an idea, an institution, a movement, a system. It was born with the idea of a Methodist minister who thought it would be a good thing to have a summer camp meeting of two weeks for Sunday School workers. Now this is not to be confused with an evangelistic crusade. The idea was very successful and was very popular; 25 states responded and seven foreign countries. And in a short time it grew to be a program that included many other courses and covered eight weeks. In a sense it became a kind of liberal arts college in the summer and followed through with courses of study during the winter. Thomas Edison and Albert Hubbard were among those who got diplomas, and over 8,000 people received these certificates and diplomas of recognition. It was so well-established that the New York legislature gave it the dignity of an institution, and it was recognized by legislative act

that it should be governed by a board of trustees of 24 members who served without pay.

Now the movement part of the definition covers a half century: 1874 to 1924. It includes both the stationary or independent chautaugua, which was usually around a lake, a grove of trees, or a stream, and this eventually spread to 500 towns and communities all the way from New York to Oregon. And it also includes the traveling chautauqua, which ultimately reached 12,000 communities, serving perhaps 35 million people--two-fifths of the adult population of the United States.

The system refers to the tent chautauqua or the circuit chautauqua, which was the traveling chautuaqua, which was so well described by my colleague Dr. Oliver. The chautauqua was as American as baseball and apple pie and flourished primarily among the rural areas of the Midwest and the western states.

Second, let's ask how come the chautauqua came into being. Well, there was hunger and starvation across the land. Oh, not the kind the newspapers and politicians holler about today, but people were looking for something to feed their minds and their souls. They yearned for something outside of themselves, something to latch onto to improve their lot in life. They felt they were missing something. They felt a bit gypped or underpriviledged in matters of education, social belonging and gracious living. In my farm community of 44 families, I could point to only one person who had more than an eighth grade education, and he was the preacher. The Bible and the Sears Roebuck catalog were the chief books in the home library and, of course, you know the Sears Roebuck catalog served many purposes. A train ride was a rare experience and parlor entertainment consisted largely of a family album, familiar views, and victrola records. Telephones were still a novelty; inside plumbing was a rare luxury, even in town. No wonder the crowds gathered at the railroad station when the trains came in. No wonder the girls, in the words of Carl Sandburg, "leaned their

heads against the bars and wondered where the trains ran to." Because there might be a place where there is romance and real dreams that never go smash. As Victor Hugo once wrote, "Greater than an army is an idea whose time has come." The time was ripe for the coming of the chautauqua.

Then let us ask a third question: What did the chautauqua have to offer? Well here are some of its claims. It claimed that it would build a cooperating community spirit and remove some of the barriers of politics and church denominationalism. It claimed to bring entertainment of a better sort--better than that offered by the carnival and the circus. It claimed its major function was educational--to spread information, to challenge thought, and to inspire better living. And it claimed to give children guidance and experience in playground recreation and creative expression. Now it fulfilled most of these claims by offering a balanced program of music, theatre, and lectures.

The backbone of the chautauqua was the lecture, and there were three kinds: the lecture to challenge thought, the lecture to inform, and the lecture to inspire. And, yes, the lecture to inspire was dominant--it was the most sure-fire. These programs were interspersed with music, plays, chalk-talks, magic, etcetera. But to get the sweep and the feel of the chautauqua one must look at the vacant lot on the edge of town where the tall weeds are--this spot of wilderness. It has just been mowed the day before and cleared of all boxes and debris, and then on that next morning when the stores begin to open you could hear the voices saying "Here comes the chautauqua!"

The big gray wagon loaded with balls of canvas, stakes, ropes, and tools rolled up the street and out on the chautauqua grounds, and materials are scattered in measured spots forming a big oval where the tent will stand. Crew-boys, the platform superintendent, local helpers came to hoist the center poles like masts on a ship. Guy ropes, pulleys, anchor

stakes make up the skeleton rigging. Now all hands turn to unfolding the large balls of canvas and laying them out to match so they can be laced, hooked and snapped together into one huge piece that will cover 2,000 people. And now with the blocks and tackle and a special team of strong men, the great tent is raised at the center poles to form the kind of A-shaped roof, and the few anchor ropes and the eave poles are adjusted. In a matter of a few minutes we can say, "Ah, there she stands--the majestic temple of joy and learning!" And now all is ready for the seats, and this takes many more hours. The platform, the piano, and the wiring--this is all a good day's work with no time out for lunch.

In the next five or six days trains will be bringing in talent, and these talented people have an aura of glamour. They're always fine looking, well-dressed, and well-mannered people. There will be the musicians, the actors, the Alpine Yodelers, the jubilee singers, the cartoonists, the magicians and the platform orators. And, yes, there may be some very prominent people: Mme. Schumann-Heinck, William Jennings Bryan, William Howard Taft, Joe Cannon, and Catherine Ridgeway, who was a very famous reader. All this gives promise to bring cheer to many a nook and corner of the farm homes and stores around Main Street. The image of the chautauqua was good. The image was a success. Even the struggling carnivals latched onto this image by calling their own show the Chautauqua Carnival. At a town in Texas sponsoring a poultry show they were a little skeptical about its success, so they advertised "Come to the poultry chautauqua."

Now the fourth question: How did it work and what made it go? For me, this is still a source of mystery and wonderment. To me it still stands as a miracle. The chautauqua business called for men and women of vision, of faith, of courage, of initiative, of endless patience, and a lot of hard labor and great endurance. It certainly was no place for the lazy and no place for the weak or faint-hearted. And at the top of the structure was

the owner. He was the chief executive who furnished the money. He risked his fortune. He hired the talent. He arranged and set up the program and ran the home office. There were only a dozen to 20 of these in the entire nation.

The owner hired and trained the cicuit manager, who was his key man, and this man was in charge of operations of a territory that usually covered 75 to 100 towns. The Redpath Horner chautauquas had three of these managers. The cicuit managers hired the traveling superintendent, the crew, and the advance men, and the key man in this line-up was the superintendent or the local platform manager. He had to be a tough top sergeant, a diplomat, a salesman. He had to be a public relations expert and general trouble-shooter. His big job was, of course, to get the iron-clad contract for the next year, and he was hired and fired largely on that basis. He was expected to get 90 percent of the towns he served to renew the contract for next year. He also introduced the talent, arranged their travel schedule, and their hotel accomodations.

The crew was made up of some husky, athletic college boys, not the Phi Beta Kappas. And then there was the junior supervisor called the "chautauqua girl," who was usually 30 or 40 years old. The crew had charge of ticket-selling, lighting the tents, seating, and all the equipment (usually valued at about $20,000). Now the advance men were the loners. They came into the town two weeks before the chautauqua opened and shored up the publicity and the season ticket sale. Such is a brief sketch of the capital, the executive officers, the organizational structure, and the promotional and chore people.

Now, what were some of the trials and tribulations of the crew and talent? We must remember that there was an unwritten law that everybody lived by. This law read: "The show must go on. This is show business." The talent faced a new town every day and the crew a new town every week. And don't forget that

these were the good ole days. There was no air conditioning. The big tent in the afternoons got awfully hot and so did the hotels and the restaurants. A hotel toilet and bath was a rare luxury, and the train accommodations along the prairie towns were awful. Four or five hours of sleep in a bed was a blessed experience, and the biggest headache of all, of course, was transportation. And next to transportation were the rain storms and the wind storms that threatened to blow the tent into shreds. And, of course, the mosquitoes and the flies were everywhere, and stomach upsets were very common.

But the show must go on! Well, there was a daring experience of a superintendent that I knew--this was in Mexico. He couldn't get the local agent to flag the 2:00 a.m. mail train to make the only possible connection for the evening's talent people to get to the next place in western Oklahoma. So he tried the Mission Impossible. He bought a big flashlight, got the talent people down around the railroad station with all the baggage and, in more or less the manner of a train robbery, he flagged the train. This he did six nights in a row.

And there was William Jennings Bryan who had to go by auto over dirt roads for 80 miles when the floods washed out the tracks of the train that he was to ride. Arrangements were formerly made for driving two cars--one as a spare to complete the mission of the railroad. William Jennings Bryan, being such a leading figure, sparked the idea of making this a party which created a caravan of five automobiles. Away they went on the great tour of 80 miles. But every car either broke down or got stuck in the mud except one, and Bryan had to be shifted from car to car--to the one that was still left. They finally made it, but it was 10:30 p.m. instead of 8:00! But there was the audience, cheering on his arrival.

On another occasion Bryan was on a train headed for Sioux Falls, 103 miles away. Thirty miles out, the car on his own train ran off the

track. Bryan sent a telegram asking for a fast automobile to pick him up, but the car got stuck on the wagon roads. They finally got a farmer out of bed to pull them out. Later, the car got lost on the road and lost some more time, but they finally got to their destination--12:10 midnight! And the audience was still there shouting. Bryan closed that speech at 2:08 a.m.

And there's the case of the Sunflower Girls from the state of Kansas. The trio gave a show one evening in Texas. This was in the month of May. They had to drive a Ford 150 miles to Amarillo to catch a train at 3:00 in the morning. They were warned the driver often fell asleep, but these girls made up their minds they would keep him awake with entertainment and questions and prod him along. Nobody was worried that he'd run off the road or hit another car or an abutment of a culvert; they were worried he might hit a cow, for three-fourths of the journey was over the open prairie.

Now, next to the transportation, was the headache of winds and storms. One girl violinist was in three tent blow-downs in one season. She didn't worry about life and limb; she worried about her precious violin. She always managed to duck under the grand piano, but there were other causualties from exhaustion. These were more numerous than the causualties from storms. Talent could not stand the pace and heat. Joe Cannon, Speaker of the House, collapsed while speaking in Winfield, Kansas on July 16, 1910. Colonel Cooper, a veteran of the platform, died from exhaustion while lecturing in Bloomington, Illinois, and several other deaths were caused by sheer drain of physical strength. Lecturing on the chautauqua platform was indeed an occupational hazard.

Now, question six: What brought on the rapid decline of the chautauqua? What made it fall apart like the one-horse shay? The rapid decline of the chautauqua was due to many things that seemed to converge almost at the same time. First, there were better roads and,

concurrently, that meant more automobiles and better automobiles. Concurrently, the movies were coming along with their spectacular pictures--"Ben Hur," "The Birth of a Nation." And then there was the rapid growth of the civic clubs. The community itself had the thing that discouraged the chautauquas, because of the growth of the Rotary Club, the Kiwanis Club, and the Lions Club. These clubs pulled in a lot of talent from outside and therefore the community didn't need the programs that they used to have. And then came, of course, the radio with its Amos 'n Andy and the silly little shows in the afternoon. But the clincher that ruined the chautauqua movement was the ten percent amusement tax. This hurt. Local people felt that the chautauqua was educational; that's what they were told. It was not for amusement and, therefore, the local supporters soured on the chautauqua managers and blamed them rather than the government for letting this happen.

The final question: What were the markings upon our culture? What were the fruits of this heritage of the last frontier? Well, first, it was a force in awakening a desire for better education. It was a catalyst for the introduction and expansion of correspondence courses, of study courses by mail, and of the university extension programs. The University of Chicago almost lifted, bodily, the correspondence courses of study that were set up in Chautauqua, New York, and the University of Chicago has long been the center of correspondence study courses. And for one whole decade here at the university where I taught in Lawrence, Kansas, there were more students enrolled in correspondence study than there were in the regular university.

Second, it was a significant pioneer force for the development of recreational services for the youth. It pointed the way for the supervised playgrounds and for recreational centers, and it was a great boost to the Boy Scout movement and Campfire Girls activities. And this, I think, is of some interest to theatre people--the chautauqua took the sin out of

the theatre. The theatre in those days was really an object of suspect. The theatre was looked upon as the invention of the devil with its painted women, who showed their ankles and occasionally their knees, and the men actors were kind of queer. People would say, what a shame that these able-bodied men aren't working in field and factory. But the plays like "Turn to the Right," "The Shepherd of the Hills," and "A Man from Home" had strong moral overtones. And the Benn Greek Players and the Caldron Players, who played Shakespeare, did much to bring Shakespeare to the hinterland. The chautauqua was a spawning ground for meaningful self-expression by means of the spoken word. The chautauqua provided a favorable climate for the rise and development of skills that apply to public address, rhetoric and theatre arts. It offered root concepts for the germination and growth of those disciplines which found their way into the college classrooms. Theatre, oral interpretation, and rhetoric, with all their ramifications, found that the chautauqua not only helped to open the door to bring speech as an academic discipline to the colleges, it helped to keep it there. And I suspect that for a quarter of a century, from 1930 to 1955, more than half of the source materials for M.A. and Ph.D. theses were devoted to men and women who won distinction on the lyceum and chautauqua platform.

Finally, the chautauqua and lyceum did much to pave the way for the liberal and progressive legislative reforms. Here many concepts were germinated and cultivated for the rise of the social conscience that became manifest in the 20th century--women's suffrage, income tax, anti-trust laws, child labor laws, and other laws for labor welfare, Philippine independence, control of public utilities and railroads. The chautauqua always had an open season for anyone who wanted to take pot shots at Wall Street. And the chautauqua did much to cut down the power of Wall Street and give the common man a better chance. And although science and machines have altered the rise of the last frontier in the context of material things, it was the last frontier that left us

the heritage of social and human values preserved by many laws which enrich our culture in this day of jet sets, protest marches and moon rockets.

# THE CHAUTAUQUA

(Delivered July 4, 1976, at the Chautauqua Bicentennial Celebration, South Park, Lawrence, Kansas)

We hear the expression--"History is a bucket of ashes." If this be true, what in God's green acres are we doing here celebrating the Bicentennial on the 4th of July? Christmas, the electric lights, the automobile, the church steeple, the Statue of Liberty tell us the story that history is not a bucket of ashes, but a vast collection of precious gems in the form of things and ideas to give us glad strength and new ways to find happiness.

So, in the mood of the Bicentennial, let us look at one precious gem called "The Chautauqua." The Chautauqua can be defined from four points of view: (1) an idea, (2) an institution, (3) a movement, (4) a system.

The Chautauqua as an idea is a classic example of an idea in tune with the times. It was born in hunger for learning. An eighth grade education was a rare thing for most of the country people. There was a yearning for culture, inspiration, and gracious living. There was malnutrition of mind and soul.

In its early stages the Chautauqua was labeled an institution by the state legislature of New York. It was a unique educational device marked by seminars, readings, and correspondence study offering a certificate and diploma. Thomas A. Edison was a student.

It was a movement spread over a half century, beginning in 1874, to bring education and enjoyment to a variety of community centers of rural America.

Finally, the Chautauqua was a system, a business-oriented scheme to bring culture to towns and villages of rural midwest. The idea

spread like a prairie fire and blazed forth in all its glory the first quarter of this century covering 12,000 communities and 40,000,000 consumers. Teddy Roosevelt said the Chautauqua was as American as baseball.

The backbone of the Chautauqua was the platform lecturer. I heard Teddy Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Billy Sunday, Judge Kenesaw Landis, Senator Robert La Follette, and William Jennings Bryan, the king of the platform.

The Chautauqua also had its bell ringers, chalk talks, bands, orchestra, singers, magicians, puppet shows, and theatrical performances.

The image of the Chautauqua was good. Its image was success. Even a town in Texas sponsoring a poultry show advertised its show with placards "COME TO THE POULTRY CHAUTAUQUA."

It was difficult to make the Chautauqua go. There was an unwritten law--"The show must go on." The biggest headache was transportation. The only way was a railroad train, and the railroad accommodations at best were terrible. Next was the weather--wind, rain, lightning, floods. The food in most eating places was lousy; stomach upsets were common. Hotels with inside plumbing were a luxury. Happiness was a night of five hours of sleep.

Then, like a house of cards, this whole thing collapsed. How come this glorious bubble burst? This was caused by the coming of the radio, the movies, the automobile, and worst of all, the ten percent amusement tax.

In a cultural and social sense the Chautauqua left a harvest of blessings. (1) It was a pioneer originator of university extension education by correspondence courses. KU at one time had more enrolled in such courses than in the regular university program. (2) It was a pioneer force in the supervision of recreation for the young. It gave a big boost to the Boy Scout movement and Girl Scout campfire

activity. (3) It paved the way for much of our liberal legislative reform--the income tax, women's suffrage, anti-trust laws, labor welfare, protection from Wall Street, and so on. (4) It took sin out of the theatre. (5) It lit the candle that changed my lifestyle leading to a college education and the profession of being a college speech teacher.

Baseball and Chautauqua both carried the trademark "Made in America." While baseball is very much alive and the Chautauqua is not, let us not forget, the Chautauqua left us a heritage of social and human values preserved by many laws which enrich our culture and way of life that do not show up on the scoreboard or in Baseball's Hall of Fame.

## TEN GUIDELINES FOR HAPPINESS WHILE GROWING OLDER

(The following guidelines were written in connection with a retirement seminar conducted in the mountains of Colorado in June of 1976)

(1) Get plenty of sleep, but not too much. Here lies your most private and precious source of energy.

(2) Stop feeling sorry for yourself. The more you wallow in your own misery, the more you reap the fruits of bitterness to destroy faith in yourself and your Creator.

(3) Seek ways to enjoy keeping company with yourself--you will find your most enchanted listener. Look for your better self and make your better self worth knowing.

(4) Guard your sense of tranquility. Keep busy doing something you like to do, but avoid too many crucial deadlines that create tension. Only one deadline matters--that one you can't control.

(5) Don't lose your sense of humor. It is your best tonic--tax free.

(6) The older you get the more family and friends mean to you. Go that extra mile to show them the better side of your nature.

(7) Cultivate the growth of your mind and soul with some new sprouts of wisdom.

(8) Look forward, not backward. Welcome new ventures in self-renewal by keeping in touch with people, mother nature, the creative arts, and God....

(9) Pray for the serenity to accept the things you cannot change, courage to change the things you can, and the wisdom to know the difference.

(10) Be grateful that the physical part of you does not have to live forever. There is a blessing in your last breath that is part of the same divine law that gave you the first breath. The life everlasting is another matter.

Prof and Lois Buehler, 1974